

WYCLIFFE COLLEGE LIBRARY



3 1761 02871 5506







THE
PRIMITIVE AND CATHOLIC FAITH,

IN
RELATION

TO THE
CHURCH OF ENGLAND,

BY THE
REV. BOURCHIER WREY SAVILE, M.A.,

RECTOR OF SHILLINGFORD, EXETER;
AUTHOR OF THE TRUTH OF THE BIBLE," ETC., ETC.

"Where Jesus Christ is, there is the Catholic Church."—IGNATIUS, BISHOP OF ANTIOCH, A.D. 107.

"Evangelical teaching is grace by faith; justification in Christ; and sanctification through the power of the Holy Ghost."—CYRIL, BISHOP OF ALEXANDRIA, A.D. 412.

"Ad antiquitatem confugite; ad sacros Patres redite; ad Ecclesiam Primitivam respicite."—BISHOP PEARSON, A.D. 1659.

LONDON:
LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO,

1875,

P R E F A C E.

THE history of Christianity, when viewed in one aspect, has been a long-continued struggle against that spirit of priestcraft or sacerdotalism, which, germinating in the time of the apostles, (when they, speaking by the Holy Ghost, predicted the rise of that fearful power, variously described under the titles, "that Man of Sin," "*the Wicked One*," "Babylon the Great," "the Mother of Harlots and Abominations of the Earth,") appears to have received its final accomplishment in our day, when a body of men, under the high-sounding title of "the Vatican Council," have decreed the "Infallibility" of a poor aged sinner like ourselves, making him thereby equal with God, or, to quote the exact words of Scripture, "as God sitting in the temple of God, showing himself to be a god." (2 Thess. ii. 4.)

But the spirit of sacerdotalism is not confined to that fallen Church, whose "faith" was once "spoken of throughout the whole world," (Rom. i. 8;) it has been vigorously struggling for existence during the last forty years within our own communion, and now appears to have reached its culminating point when the Shibboleth of the party, for which there will be found ample evidence in the following pages, is expressed in this formula, "one in faith and sacraments with the Church of

Rome;" or, as one of the organs of the Ritualistic press declares, that the work of the party is "a carefully organized attempt to bring our Church and country up to the full standard of the (Roman) Catholic faith, and eventually to plead for her union with the see of St. Peter." Hence, says the author of the *Kiss of Peace*, "The Church of England holds *precisely* the same view of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper as the Church of Rome."

The chief object of this present work is to show the resemblance between the doctrines of the Reformed Church of England, as interpreted by the "Evangelical" party, and those held and taught by the Primitive Church in the earliest and purest days of her existence; as well as to urge upon all the duty of cultivating a closer communion with other Protestant Churches who hold the same faith with ourselves, though not under Episcopal government. In so doing the Author has been compelled to enter into a lengthened consideration of the claims of the other school of religious thought, commonly termed "Ritualists," as to their being distinctive upholders of the Primitive and Catholic Faith. Thus, in the early days of the Oxford movement, Dr. J. H. Newman wrote, "I had a supreme confidence in our cause. We were upholding that *primitive Christianity* which was delivered for all time by the early teachers of the Church, and which was registered and attested in the Anglican formularies and by the Anglican divines."

Dr. Manning once wrote in a similar strain respecting the true Catholicity of the Church of England, though he may possibly regret his incautious words, now that he has received the full reward of his apostasy in the shape of a cardinal's hat from that power which assumes to be above all kings and princes of the earth, in accordance with the apostolic prediction of "that

wicked," or "*the lawless one*,"¹ mentioned in 2 Thess. ii. 8. His words are as follows:—

"I humbly thank God that He has permitted me to be a member of a Church in which I am not worthy to keep the door. . . . We rest upon a basis of facts, laid by the providence of our Divine Head; and on that basis we believe firmly that *the Church of England is a true and living member of the Holy Catholic Church*: neither heretical in dogma, nor schismatical in the unhappy breach of Christendom." (*Charge*, July, 1845, p. 57.

It is notorious that the Ritualists of the present day are perpetually insisting upon their principles being exclusively *Primitive and Catholic*. Thus, at a large meeting of the party met to protest against the ruling of the Supreme Ordinary of the Church in the famous case of *Martin v. Mackonochie*, notwithstanding their solemn vows of obedience, it was resolved, among other things, "that that judgment disregards the Church of England's fundamental principle of connection with and reference to the practice of the Church *Primitive and Catholic*." In support of this theory, a clergyman writes to the *Church Review*, under the signature of "Village Parson," to express his

¹ Mr. Gladstone, in his admirable pamphlet on *Vaticanism*, p. 36, hints at a case which has been already mentioned in the *Times*, and which, he says, "may possibly again become the object of public notice," as a specimen of the Papal claim to be "above all law," and which is thus specified by a writer in *Macmillan's Magazine* for February, 1875: "Dr. Manning will not deny that within the last few years a marriage has been celebrated in an English Roman Catholic Church, one of the parties to which was already lawfully married according to British law, and whose lawful wife (a Protestant) was and is still living; nor can he deny that this *scandalous act* is stated to have been performed in accordance with the advice of 'religious persons learned in the law of marriage, as recognised in the Roman Catholic Church.'"

opinion on the same case in the following way:—"I hope you are getting on in London, *malgré* this 'Star Chamber' affair. As for me, I hold that the first six General Councils, and the rite of the whole *Catholic* Church as to *lights* and *incense*, to be quite sufficiently paramount for our guidance; and woe be to those lawyers who would abolish *the sign of our Lord's Divinity*! Surely if the Queen endorses their 'opinions,' she will forfeit her title of 'nursing-mother' of the Church of England, which is *Catholic*. And whoever would divest her of her *Catholicity*, sets up a new and unscriptural Church."!!! Seeing that "the Queen" did confirm the "opinions of those lawyers" who have "abolished the sign of our Lord's Divinity" in the *Mackonochie* case, as Supreme Ordinary, thereby constituting that judgment the law of the Church, she must now be considered both as a schismatic and a heretic in the estimation of that party which is so well represented by a "Village Parson." But no one with a spark of loyalty or Christianity, or who is in any way acquainted with the rudiments of the "Primitive and Catholic Faith," will give a moment's heed to the ravings of such a fanatic, over whom we should rather mourn, and for whose conversion we should earnestly pray.

Although adherence to the Primitive and Catholic Faith is very commonly and boastfully insisted upon by the Ritualists, when we come to examine their doctrines and their practice, we see the wide gulf which separates them from the Primitive Christians, as the Author has endeavoured to show in the following pages. Respecting the differences between the two chief parties which unhappily divide the Church of England at this present time—the Evangelicals and the Ritualists, or Sacerdotalists, as they are sometimes termed—they may be sufficiently expressed under these three heads:—

1st. The opinion entertained respecting our Reformers.

2nd. The definition of Protestantism.

3rd. The interpretation of the Gospel.

Respecting the *first* head, the Evangelical regards the Church Reformers of the sixteenth century, such as Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, as "martyrs of Jesus" for the cause which they believed and knew to be the truth; the Ritualist pronounces them to be "unredeemed villains," and declares that "in cruelty, impiety, and licentiousness," they far exceeded Robespierre, Danton, and Marat, the bloodthirsty monsters of the first French Revolution.

Respecting the *second* head, the Evangelical defines Protestantism to be a religious profession witnessing on *behalf of* the Primitive and Catholic Faith, and *against* the many fatal errors of the Church of Rome; the Ritualist defines the religion of Protestants in the following terms:—as more suitable to the "pothouse" than to the Church, according to the Dean of Manchester; "the poison of Protestant heresy," according to the *Church News*; "the ulcerous cancer of Protestantism," according to the *Church Times*; "that cold, miserable, unloving, godless figment called *Protestantism*," according to Mr. Mackonochie; or, according to the language employed by one of the early leaders of the Oxford movement, "I say *anathema* to the principles of *Protestantism*, and to all its forms and sects and denominations. Likewise to all persons who knowingly and willingly, and understanding what they do, shall assert either for themselves or for the Church of England the principle of *Protestantism*, or maintain the Church of England to have one and the same common religion with one or all of the various forms and sects of Protestantism, or shall communicate themselves in the principles of Protestant

sects, or give the communion to their members, or go about to establish any intercommunion between our Church and them.”²

As regards the *third* head, the Evangelical interprets “the Gospel of the grace of God,” as St. Paul termed it in his charge to the elders of the Church of Ephesus, in accordance with the declaration of an eminent father of the fifth century, that the meaning of all “Evangelical teaching is grace by faith, justification in Christ, and sanctification through the power of the Holy Ghost;” the Ritualist teaches so many doctrines not to be found in Scripture, and totally unknown to the Primitive Church, that we cannot but fear the Gospel they preach is of that character which is described by St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Galatians, as “another Gospel,” a “perversion of the Gospel of Christ” by “false brethren unawares brought in,” which we are commanded to reject, even though it were preached to us by an apostle or “an angel from heaven.” It is quite true that the Ritualists are an active, zealous, hard-working party, with much boasting of what they have done and will do in their Romeward and Romanizing course; but so were the *Pharisees* in ancient times, and so have been the *Jesuits* in modern days; to both of which they bear no little resemblance: for it may be truly said of them, as it was of the former, that they are altogether self-righteous and despise others;³ while their likeness to the latter is described in the words of the late Mr. Keble, when advocating the necessity of *Auricular Confes-*

² W. Palmer’s (Magdalene College, Oxford) *Letter to Golightly*, p. 12, 1841.

³ The *Church Times* of Feb. 23rd, 1867, describes the Ritualists as “the party for energy, devotion and brains;” while of the Evangelicals it is written, “Impudence seems to be the *forte* of this petty clique of Puritans and Free-thinkers.”

sion. He then said, "*We are working in the dark*"—a fitting emblem of that secret system, the quintessence of ultramontaniam, which, whenever "touched by Ithuriel's spear," and brought into the light of day, has horrified and appalled mankind to a degree which no words can express. The zeal of our Ritualistic brethren is frankly admitted, but then we must consider it to be of that nature which the apostle terms "not according to knowledge;" they have it is true "a form of godliness," but they evidently "deny the power thereof." It is from such that the faithful are commanded in Scripture to "turn away," as they are to "withdraw from every brother that walketh disorderly," and to "avoid them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned" from the Word of God, and which are peculiarly pertinent to the practice and profession of that sect whose principles may be summed up in these two sentences, "*above all law*," and "*the right of private judgment warrants every act which is proper in our own eyes*." The reader will be enabled to judge how far this is the case when he sees the evidence adduced in the following pages.

The Author would add a few words in reference to the spirit in which all controversy, especially that which comes under the head of "theological," should be carried on by professed disciples of the meek and lowly Saviour. Having recently had some experience in private correspondence of the spirit displayed by some who belong to the Ritualistic school, he gladly bears testimony to the fact of its being most Christian; and he would fain express his sincere hope that in the course of this work there has been, while earnestly "contending for the faith once delivered to the saints," no infraction on the Author's part of that divine principle which is thus characterized in Holy

Writ, "Love suffereth long and is kind; love thinketh no evil; love beareth all things, endureth all things; love never faileth."

Conscious of the very serious differences between the two chief schools of religious thought in the present day, and which are fast rending our Reformed Church in twain, the Author, in memory of the exhortation given by Gregory Nazianzen to Athanasius, "Be an adamant to them that strike you, and a loadstone to them that dissent from you," has endeavoured, when exposing the "offences" and "hard speeches" of those from whom he differs so much, to quote their *ipsissima verba*, so that each one may be allowed to speak for himself. It is by contending in such a spirit, the most effective weapon of all controversies, that we are enabled to enforce the advice of George Herbert :—

"Be calm in arguing, for fierceness makes
Error a fault, and truth discourtesy.
Why should I feel another man's mistakes
More than his sickness or his poverty?
In love I should, but anger is not love,
Nor wisdom neither; therefore gently move."

While, therefore, the Author has attempted in the present work to expose the fatal errors which prevail, alas! with so large a portion of the clergy of the Church of England in the present day, as he trusts in the spirit of true Christian charity, another apostolic command should not, at the same time, be forgotten,— "This witness is true. Therefore rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith; not giving heed to Jewish fables, and commandments of men, that turn from the truth." (Titus i. 13, 14.) Nor may we forget what inspiration teaches respecting the test of all true discipleship,— "Marvel

not, my brethren, if the world hate you. We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren. . . . Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God; and every one that loveth Him that begat loveth him also that is begotten of Him. By this we know that we love the children of God, when we love God and keep His commandments. Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that when He shall appear, we shall be like Him; for we shall see Him as He is. . . . He which testifieth these things saith, Surely I come quickly. Amen. Even so, come, Lord Jesus."

B. W. S.

SHILLINGFORD RECTORY,

Easter, 1875.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. Definition of terms ; Protestant and Catholic	1
II. The Faith of the Primitive Church	11
III. The Practice of the Primitive Church	20
IV. The Doctrine of the Primitive Church	38
V. The Doctrine of the Lord's Supper	46
VI. The Christian "Altar"	58
VII. The Doctrine of Sacrifice	68
VIII. The Real Presence	86
IX. Vestments	110
X. Lights	132
XI. Incense	137
XII. The Eastward Position	146
XIII. Auricular Confession	158
XIV. Priestly Absolution	179
XV. Prayer for the Dead	195
XVI. Pictures and Images	205
XVII. The Reformed Church of England	220
Appendix	260
Index	273

THE PRIMITIVE AND CATHOLIC FAITH.

CHAPTER I.

DEFINITION OF TERMS—PROTESTANT AND CATHOLIC.

AN unknown author has recently asked the following question of those who cordially accept the Apostle's determination to "know nothing but Jesus Christ and Him crucified," as their rule of faith and practice in their action towards God and man :—

"Might it not tend greatly to strengthen the hands of Protestants of the Church of England, and advance the cause of Christ in the world, if a law were passed allowing clergymen, with the consent of their parishioners, to invite ordained ministers belonging to any of the other great Protestant Churches in our country to occupy their pulpits, and permitting clergymen to accept similar invitations from their Nonconformist brethren? Would not the accomplishment of this give us the advantages of National Religion, without many of the present disadvantages of the Established Church; banish in a great degree the pride of the Conformist, and the envy of the Nonconformist, and whilst allowing a healthy diversity of opinion on minor points, establish unity in essentials of religion on the broadest basis, and knit the Protestants of Britain and her colonies into one compact body?"

Cordially assenting to the above proposition, so far as it may be attempted to be "done decently and in order" according to the Apostolic command, and with a solemn sense of the issues

involved in so important a change, we would remind our brethren of the Church of England, of the necessity which is laid upon us, especially at this time, of fulfilling the command of another Apostle by "earnestly contending for the faith once for all (*apax*) delivered to the saints."

But inasmuch as there are two prominent parties in the Church of England, who are commonly termed "Ritualists" and "Evangelicals," or as at other times "Catholics" and "Protestants," and wishing to avoid at the outset giving offence by the adoption of party names, we content ourselves with attempting a definition of those two last terms according to what we believe to be their true and ancient and proper meaning.

As the terms "Catholic" and "Protestant" are so variously understood at the present time, it may be well to point out, that although the former name is exclusively assumed by, and too often conceded by unthinking Protestants to the Church of Rome, if we regard the teaching of the Primitive Church, to which all schools of religious thought profess their readiness to defer, we shall find a far more accurate and scriptural definition of that well-known term than many in the present day are willing to allow.

The first time we meet with the term is to be found in the Epistle said to have been written to the Smyrnæans by Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, and martyred within a few years of St. John's death, and which, as it may have been composed within a century of the martyr's death, very naturally exhibits all the Christian simplicity of those primitive times, as the term is thus beautifully defined, "Whosoever Jesus Christ is, there is the *Catholic Church*"¹—which is evidently the primitive interpretation of our Lord's declaration, "Where two or three are gathered together in my name there am I in the midst of them."

¹ Epistle to the Smyrnæans, chap. viii. This is the reading of the *shorter* recension. The longer reads—"Where Christ is, there does all the heavenly host stand by." But as this Epistle is not found among the three Epistles of which we have a Syriac version, many scholars hesitate about receiving it as a genuine writing of Ignatius.

The earliest authentic use of the term, of which the age of the composition is undoubted, is to be found in the circular Epistle addressed by the Church at Smyrna to the Church at Philomelium, and through that Church to the whole Christian world, in order to give a succinct account of the circumstances attending the martyrdom of Polycarp, Bishop of that city, which commences in the following primitive way: "The Church of God which sojourns at Smyrna to the Church of God sojourning in Philomelium, and to all the congregations of the holy and *Catholic Church* in every place: Mercy, peace, and love from God the Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, be multiplied."

The first authoritative definition of the term is to be seen in a decree of the Emperor Theodosius made towards the close of the fourth century, wherein it was declared that "that Church should alone be called *Catholic* which equally worshipped and glorified the three persons in the blessed Trinity."² By this we learn that according to the law of the Primitive Church the only thing required to constitute a true "Catholic" was a belief in the doctrine of the Trinity—which doctrine is embodied in that mediæval symbol erroneously termed in our Prayer Book "The Creed of Saint Athanasius" in these words, "The Catholic Faith is this: That we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity."

The Church of England appears to adopt this primitive definition of the term "Catholic" in her *Prayer for all Conditions of Men*, as she therein teaches her members to "pray for the good estate of the Catholic Church; that all who profess and call themselves Christians may be led into the way of truth, and hold the faith in unity of spirit, in the bond of peace, and in righteousness of life;" which alone can be applied to those who equally worship the ever blessed Trinity.

The Church of Rome, on the other hand, while defiantly trampling upon the express definition of the Primitive Church in respect to equally worshipping the three persons in the

² Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.*, lib. vii. c. 4.

Trinity, for she adds a *fourth*³ to share that glory which Jehovah pointedly declines "to give to another," (Isa. xlii. 8,) refuses to concede the title of Catholic to the two-thirds of Christendom who reject her claims to Supremacy and Infallibility; but appears to be almost beside herself with anger at the presumption of the Church of England in adopting such a term, conveniently ignoring the historical fact, that from the time when the Gospel was first preached in Britain (probably by St. Paul himself) down to the present day—including the three periods, viz., of the first six centuries when the ancient British Church was entirely independent, then during the Roman usurpation from the sixth to the sixteenth centuries, and lastly the post-Reformation period of the last three centuries—the Church of Christ in this country has always claimed and had conceded to her by all whose judgment is worth having the title of "Catholic." Yet even so excellent and moderate a man as the late Count Montalembert could so far forget himself, as well as the notorious facts of history, as to write to the late Rev. J. Mason Neale, of the Cambridge Camden Society, in the following strain; though he must have felt some pangs of remorse on his death-bed when he heard of the bitter animosity exhibited by Pope Pius IX. towards him for the spark of independence which he had once displayed against the intolerable assumptions of the Papacy, and which so fully

³ The following "Prayer," published in Rome in 1825, *with the License of the Superiors*, will show how far the modern Church of Rome contradicts the teaching of the Ancient Catholic Church respecting the duty of *equally* worshipping the three persons in the Trinity:—

"I adore you, Eternal Father.

"I adore you, Eternal Son.

"I adore you, Most Holy Spirit.

"*I adore you, Most Holy Virgin, Queen of the Heavens, Lady and Mistress of the Universe.*"

So in the year 1840, Pope Gregory XVI. granted an indulgence of 100 years from purgatory for the recital of the following prayer:—

"O immaculate Queen of Heaven and of Angels! *I adore you.* It is you who have delivered me from hell. It is you from whom I look for all my salvation."

justifies the Protestant interpretation of St. Paul's prophecy concerning that "Man of Sin," or "that Wicked One whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of His mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of His coming :"—

"I protest," wrote Count Montalembert, "against the most unwarrantable and unjustifiable assumption of the name *Catholic* by people and things belonging to the actual Church of England. The attempt to steal away from us, and appropriate to the use of a fraction of the Church of England the glorious title of Catholic, is proved to be an usurpation by every monument of the past and present. I protest, therefore, against the usurpation of a sacred name by the Camden Society as iniquitous ; and I next protest against the objects of this Society, and all such efforts in the Anglican Church as absurd."

Passing by the not very courteous tone adopted by the writer of this letter, it may be well to remind our readers that he whom the members of the Church of Rome have regarded for so many ages as the viceregent of the Most High God, all the Protestant Churches, which were happily re-vigorated by the Holy Ghost at the Reformation of the sixteenth century, have with perfect unanimity proclaimed the Bishop of Rome, as head of that apostate community, to have fulfilled all the conditions of the inspired prediction respecting the Man of Sin. Thus, to quote only a few examples, we find that three eminent branches of Christ's Church in this kingdom—viz., the Churches of England, Scotland, and Ireland—have thus distinctly expressed themselves in reference to the Church of Rome fulfilling the divine prophecy :—

"The Bishop of Rome," says *the Church of England* in her Homilies, which, as she justly declares, contain "good and wholesome doctrine," (Art. 35,) "ought rather to be called the *Antichrist* and the successor of the Scribes and Pharisees, than Christ's Vicar, or St. Peter's successor." (Homily x. pt. iii., *On Obedience to Rulers*.) And in the Preface to the Authorized Version of the Bible, he is emphatically called, "*that Man of Sin*."

The Church of Scotland, in her *Confession of Faith*, solemnly declares that—

"The Pope is *that Man of Sin* and *Son of Perdition*, that exalteth himself in the Church against Christ, and against all that is called God."

The Church of Ireland speaks in the same strain in her Articles by affirming that—

“The Bishop of Rome’s work and doctrines plainly discover him to be *that Man of Sin* foretold in Holy Scripture, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of His mouth, and destroy with the brightness of His coming.” (Art. 80.)

It was not only our martyred Reformers who held this view respecting the predicted “Man of Sin,” but their successors, such as Bishops Jewell, Parker, Grindall, Andrews, and Hall also; and last, but not least, the “judicious” Hooker shared their opinion likewise. Hence we find an eminent divine of the Church of England in the last century justly remarking that—

“The Papists see as little concerning Antichrist as the Jews saw concerning Christ: for as the latter still look for the Messiah who is already come, so the former expect an Antichrist, who hath been for a long time revealed, and is revered by them as a God. He who will not acknowledge the Papacy to be the kingdom of Antichrist hath great reason to suspect in his heart that if he had lived with our Saviour, he would have scarce have taken Him for the Messiah.”⁴

To turn to the proper meaning of that other term of such common use in our theological controversies. Few persons seem to be aware that the first occasion in which we meet with the term “Protestant” is in the Vulgate, *i.e.*, the Roman Catholic version of the Bible, where it is mentioned in so peculiarly an instructive a manner, that it may be appropriately quoted as affording a true definition of the term “Protestant,” as set forth in the infallible Word of God. Our authorized version of 2 Chron. xxiv. 19 reads thus:—

“Yet He (God) sent prophets to them, (the Jewish people,) to bring them

⁴ Dr. Jackson *On the Creed*, b. iii. ch. viii. Any one wishing to see this subject handled in a masterly way, cannot do better than study the works of the present Bishop (Wordsworth) of Lincoln, who has proved by an overwhelming weight of evidence that the application of the prophecies of the New Testament respecting the Man of Sin and the Apocalyptic Babylon to the Bishop and Church of Rome, is as true as that the predictions in the Old Testament respecting the Messiah have been fulfilled in the person of Jesus Christ,

again unto the Lord ; and they testified against them ; but they would not give ear."

Adopting a free paraphrase of this passage, we may understand it thus with the rendering of the term "Protestant," as it is used in the Roman Catholic version of Holy Scripture:—

"Yet God sent prophets and Protestant preachers to the Jewish people who had apostatized from the Church of their fathers, and had become worshippers of images and idols, in order to bring them back again to the worship of Jehovah ; and these *Protestants* bore witness against the sin and folly of their brethren, who refused to give ear unto them." (*Quos Protestantibus illi audire volebant.—Vulgate.*)

If we consider the term "Protestant" under various aspects, we find that etymologically it must be understood as a witness, either *for* or *against* any person or matter. Theologically, we understand it as witnessing on behalf of Scriptural truth and against all Roman error. Conventionally, it is applied to all Christians (save the members of the Eastern Churches) who reject the novel claims of the Church of Rome. Its first application was on the 19th of April, 1529, when the Second Diet of Spiers passed a decree forbidding all reform until a General Council was summoned to decide the question. A minority of princes *protested* against this decree, and appealed from the report of the Diet to the infallible Word of God, and from the bigoted Emperor Charles V., who had recently made his peace with Rome, to Jesus Christ, King of Kings and Lord of Lords. A declaration was drawn up to that effect, and this was the famous *Protest* which henceforward gave the illustrious name of PROTESTANT to the renovated Church of God.⁵

It is interesting for Englishmen to remember that within two years of that memorable event, *i.e.*, on the 10th of February, 1531, after a series of quibbles and evasions, which left no little disgrace upon the bishops and clergy of the unreformed Church, the Convocation of Canterbury, under the presidency of Primate Wareham, took the first step towards separating the Church of England from the apostate Church of Rome, by

⁵ D'Aubigne's *History of the Reformation*, book xiii. ch. vi. ; Seebohm's *Era of the Protestant Revolution*, p. 163.

decreeing that, "We recognise the King's Majesty to be our only Sovereign Lord, the singular protector of the Church and clergy of England, and, as far as is allowed by the law of Christ, also as our supreme head."⁶

When these words were read aloud to the Convocation by Archbishop Wareham, they were received in silence. "Do you assent?" asked the primate. The House remained speechless. "Whoever is silent seems to consent," exclaimed the unhappy archbishop, who was strongly against breaking with Rome. A voice answered from the crowd of clergy, "Then are we all silent." And so the measure of separating from the Church of Rome, as far as the bishops and clergy were concerned, was passed; and Convocation, as the historian Froude remarks, "was allowed to return to its usual occupations, and continue the prosecutions of the heretics." A state paper of the time portrays the character of the clergy, who gave their unwilling consent to this grave measure, in the following graphic manner:—"Shrink to the clergy, and they be lions; lay their faults roundly and charitably to them, and they be as sheep, and will lightly be reformed, for their consciences will not suffer them to resist."⁷ It was not, however, until four years later that this happy measure, so blessed and prosperous to the welfare of England both in Church and State, became the law of the land, when, on the 3rd of November, 1534, the memorable act was passed wherein it was declared that:—

"Albeit the King's Majesty justly and rightfully is sought to be the Supreme Head of the Church of England, and so is recognised by the clergy of this realm in their Convocation, yet, nevertheless, for corroboration and confirmation thereof, and to extirp all errors and heresies, &c.: Be it enacted, by authority of this present Parliament, that the King our Sovereign Lord, his heirs and successors, kings of this realm, shall be taken, accepted and reputed the only Supreme Head in earth of the Church of England, called *Anglicana Ecclesia*, &c., &c., any usage, custom, foreign lawes, foreign authority, prescription, or any other thing or things to the contrary hereof notwithstanding."⁸

⁶ Burnet's *History of the Reformation*, pt. iii. book ii.

⁷ Memoranda relating to the Clergy: *Rolls House MS.*

⁸ Act of Supremacy, 26 Hen. viii. cap. 1.

A review of what has been considered will show that the title of "Catholic," according to the teaching of the Primitive Church, appertains to all who equally worship the three persons in the blessed Trinity; and therefore rightfully belongs to all persons, whether Episcopalians, Presbyterians, or Protestant Nonconformists, who receive that inestimably precious doctrine in all its grace and fulness, which necessarily includes these three points, viz., the mightiness of God the Father begetting us to a new life; the wisdom of God the Son building us up in our most holy faith; and the love of God the Holy Spirit sanctifying us, and making us meet for the inheritance of the blessed above.

While many have attempted to illustrate the great and mysterious doctrine of the Trinity, as, *e.g.*, St. Augustine in ancient times, by the attempted definition of the principle and practice of love—"Behold," says he, "there are three things: he that loves, that which is loved, and love itself;"⁹ and as John Wesley in modern times, who observes, "Here are three candles, yet there is but one light: explain this, and I will explain the mystery of the Trinity;"—it is utterly beyond the power of man to explain it. The well-known anecdote which St. Augustine records of himself when engaged in composing his work *On the Trinity* tells its own tale:—"One day, while wandering along the sea-shore deep in meditation, suddenly he beheld a child, who, having dug a hole in the sand, appeared to be bringing water from the sea to fill it. Augustine inquired what was the object of his task. He replied, that he intended to empty into the cavity all the waters of the great deep. 'Impossible!' exclaimed Augustine. 'Not more impossible,' replied the child, 'than for thee, O Augustine, to explain the mystery on which thou art now meditating.'"

The doctrine of the Trinity is indeed a great mystery, and so indeed are all the doctrines in the economy of grace. "Great is the mystery of godliness," taught the Apostle to the Gentiles; and it is the new life implanted in the awakened

⁹ Augustine *On the Trinity*, book viii. ch. x. § 14.

soul by the mighty agency of the Holy Ghost, which alone enables us to understand in any measure the power of faith and the principles of grace. As holy Archbishop Leighton, in his *Commentary on the First Epistle of Peter*, observes, that "Christian brethren are united by a three-fold cord, two wreaths of which are common to all men; but the third is the strongest, and it is theirs peculiarly. Their bodies are derived from the same man, and their souls have been created by the same God; but their *new life*, by which they are most entirely brethren, is derived from the same Mediator, Jesus Christ." It is only those who have realized this "new life" that can in any measure understand the spiritual nature of the Christian religion, and the grand distinction between it and that "form of godliness" which satisfies so many earnest, hardworking Christians in the present day, who know not "the power thereof." He who is content with letting his faith and practice rest upon outward observances, a multitude of services, frequent communions, outward fastings, crucifixes, flowers, processions, and innumerable things of a like nature, which belong more to the pomps and vanities of the world than they do to the Church of the living God, and who is destitute all the time of the internal witness of the Spirit, bearing testimony to his own individual fellowship with the Father and His Son Jesus Christ, absolutely knows nothing whatever of the power of the Gospel, or its overwhelmingly great and glorious design. Such an one may discuss its evidences, speculate about its doctrines, may rigidly observe every jot and tittle of its institutions, and the many inventions which some in their unwisdom have devised for the furtherance of what they term "Catholic principles," but as long as he knows nothing of Evangelical teaching, which one of the Christian fathers of the fourth century has so truly defined as "grace by faith, justification in Christ, and sanctification through the power of the Holy Ghost,"¹ he can only be compared to a man amusing himself with the leaves, instead of feeding on the fruits of the tree of life.

¹ Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentary on Isaiah*, book iii.

CHAPTER II.

THE FAITH OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.

WE have seen that our Lord's declaration, "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them," was understood by the Primitive Christians to imply, that whenever even two or three disciples were assembled for worship, Christ was spiritually present with them; or to quote again the language attributed to Ignatius, the martyred Bishop of Antioch, "Wheresoever Jesus Christ is, there is the Catholic Church." But how was the Lord of glory—how was He who had ascended up into the heavens, and had sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high, to be present in the midst of His people? It could only be by His Spirit. Just before He laid down His life for the sins of the world, He promised that He would send the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost and the Spirit of truth, to guide His people into all truth, and so bear witness to the coming glory. And we know how fully and literally this was accomplished by the outpouring of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost, when the assembled brethren were filled with that divine person, who had taken the place of the departed Saviour, and were in consequence enabled "to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance."

Judging from its fruits, the most successful sermon ever preached to man on earth was the one which the Apostle Peter on that day delivered to his Hebrew brethren, who were then assembled from all parts of the earth in the city of Jerusalem, for it resulted in the conversion of no less than "3,000 souls" from amongst the orthodox professors of the Jewish religion to the knowledge of the "truth as it is in Jesus."

The two chief doctrines preached by the Apostle on that memorable occasion were "Repentance," and "Remission of

sins," through faith in Jesus Christ. The people were exhorted to save themselves from that "untoward generation," and to give themselves to God for an entire renovation of heart. The Apostle exhorted them to receive the grace offered, with a due submission to that ordinance of baptism which Christ had appointed as the sign of entrance into the new covenant, when He commanded His disciples to "Go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and lo! I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." We know how this has been accomplished during the eighteen centuries' existence of the Christian Church, by the perpetual presence of the Holy Ghost in her midst, that which may be regarded as the polar star of doctrine to both the Primitive Christians as well as to that little flock which comprise the faithful of every age from that hour to the present day.

From the record of what took place on the day of Pentecost, we discern the first appearance of the Primitive Church. The 3000 converted Jews were not Christians in name only, they understood and believed the doctrines concerning repentance and remission of sins in all their spiritual significance; they continued united by the principle of loving obedience to the pastors whom God had made instruments of their conversion; they partook every Lord's-day of the ordinance of the Lord's Supper, in which they enjoyed the reality of their Saviour's spiritual presence in this Holy Communion with Him, which has been so happily expressed by the judicious Hooker, who writes on this point with deep spiritual precision:—

"The real presence of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not to be sought for in the Sacrament . . . but only in the very heart and soul of him which receiveth them. Why should any cogitation possess the mind of the faithful communicant but this, 'O my God, Thou art true; O my soul, thou art happy!'"²

Moreover, the faithful confidence of these Primitive Christians

² Hooker's *Eccles. Polity*, b. v. c. 67.

in God, and their joyful apprehension of the doctrine of pardoned sin through faith in the atoning blood of the Redeemer, were tempered with a godly fear. Every soul must have been possessed more or less of this mixture of joy and fear. They had felt the pangs of sin, and they had just learnt the only way by which that sin could be pardoned; they had seen what a price was paid for their redemption; they "rejoiced with trembling" at their escape from destruction; and the same spirit which cried "Abba, Father," in their hearts, taught them to reverence His justice and His holiness, and to dread sin above all other evils.

It may be gathered from the records of the New Testament, that the Apostles enjoyed much more of the power of spiritual religion than they had ever done while their Master was on earth. Such was the effect of the out-pouring of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost. We no longer hear of the dreams of the Apostles after temporal power, which had manifested itself when the sons of Zebedee came to Jesus demanding the privilege of sitting "one on Thy right hand and the other on Thy left hand, in Thy glory," (Mark x. 37;) for one of the most blessed signs of discipleship in the Primitive Church was poverty in the things of this world, but craving after those unsearchable riches which rust and moth cannot corrupt, and which thieves cannot steal, as exemplified in Peter's reply to the lame man, "whom they laid daily at the gate of the temple which is called Beautiful"—"Silver and gold have I none; but such as I have give I thee: in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth rise up and walk." Wherefore we must conclude that wherever the same quality of repentance, and faith, and hope, and love, and heavenly-mindedness appear amongst any body of men who equally worship and glorify the three persons in the Blessed Trinity, there is the true Primitive, Apostolic, and Catholic Church. And the assurance that "the Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved," plainly intimates whose grace it was that effected all this, and that the hand of Him who had sent the Holy Ghost to convince the world of sin, and to convert men unto the truth of the

Gospel, ought ever to be acknowledged as the only source of those spiritual truths which have been taught by the faithful of all ages and in all places, and which is summarily expressed by St. Paul in these words:—"There is one body and one Spirit, . . . one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all."³

In matters of doctrine, the Primitive Christians were of one mind and one accord, though we find evidence in the New Testament that the germ of the foretold Apostasy existed even in Apostolic times, "for the mystery of iniquity doth already work," as St. Paul taught the Thessalonians; and that both heresies and love of temporal power, as in the case of Diotrephes, were rife amongst them, we learn from the writings of St. John.⁴ The Primitive Christians all worshipped the one living and true God, who had revealed Himself to them in three persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. They recognised the First Person as He who had created them, and chosen them before the foundation of the world, that they should be holy and without blame before Him in love; the Second Person as He who had performed the grand sacrifice of Himself on the cross of Calvary *once for all*, never more to be repeated; who had wrought out for them that all perfect righteousness by which, as one of the ancients has well expressed it, "their bad deeds were washed *out* and their good deeds washed *clean*," and who had left them an example that they should follow His steps; and the Third Person as the promised Comforter and Sanctifier, who alone could make them meet to be partakers of the inheritors of the saints in light. Such was the great canon of Catholicity, which however erroneously applied in modern times by those who assume the name of "Catholic," while their doctrine and practice prove how little they are entitled to bear it, is nevertheless most true as expressed in the words of Vincent of Lerins, who speaks of the doctrines held and taught

³ Eph. iv. 4—6.

⁴ Compare 2 John 7, and 3 John 9, 10, and Rev. ii. *passim* with 2 Tim. ii. 17, 18.

by the Primitive Church as having been “believed in all places, at all times, and by all men.”⁵

Thus the Primitive Christians, who are always spoken of in the New Testament as “saints,” are described as sanctified by God the Father, *i.e.*, set apart for His own glory; by God the Son, *i.e.*, presented without spot in His atoning blood and perfect righteousness, as so beautifully expressed in one of our modern hymns:—

“Jesus, Thy blood and righteousness
My beauty are, my glorious dress,
Mid flaming worlds, in these arrayed,
With joy shall I lift up my head;”⁶

and by God the Holy Ghost, *i.e.*, taught the penalty and heinousness of sin, and the beauty of that holiness “without which no man shall see the Lord.” Hence the aim of these Primitive Christians was to resemble their Master, who, when He walked on earth, was in heaven, and of whom it has been so truly said, “that He always *repelled* sin, though He touched it at every point.” The most perfect instance of this privileged condition, of which we have ever read or heard in modern times, has been admirably described by the late Lady Powerscourt, who, of all “saints” in our own age, has perhaps as nearly fulfilled in her own lovely character as it is possible for a poor sinner the high and holy standard which she herself had set up, and which the great day of judgment will alone reveal:—“*Not one who looks up from earth to heaven, but one who looks down from heaven on earth.*”

Pass we on, therefore, to consider the picture which the early writers have drawn of the Primitive Christians, by selecting, in chronological order, a few extracts from the writings of the fathers of the first four centuries.

⁵ The complete sentence reads thus:—“In the Catholic Church itself, great care must be taken that we hold that which has been believed in all places, at all times, and by all men; for that is *Catholic*, as the word itself shows.” Vincent of Lerins, *Commonitorium*, cap. 3.

⁶ This hymn, commonly attributed to Charles Wesley, belongs in reality to Count Zinzendorf, the pious and devoted Moravian nobleman, who composed it on his voyage to Jamaica.

(1.) Thus Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, long the contemporary of the Apostle John, says :—

“Nothing is hid from us if we perfectly possess that faith and love towards Jesus Christ which are the beginning and end of life ; for the beginning is faith, and the end is love. Now these two being inseparably joined together are of God ; while all other things necessary for a holy life follow after them. No man professing a true faith sinneth ; nor does he that possesses love hate any one. The tree is more manifest by its fruit ; so those who profess to be Christians shall be known by their life ; for Christianity is not the work of mere profession ; but shows itself in the power of faith even unto the end.”⁷

(2.) Justin Martyr, who flourished about half a century later, writes :—

“Being inflamed with the desire of a pure and an eternal life, we breathe after a close converse with God, the great Parent and Creator of all, and hasten to confess our faith, convinced as we are that those who have persuaded God by their lives that they follow Him, and love to abide with Him where there is no sin to cause disturbance, can obtain these things. This is what we expect and teach, having so learnt from Jesus Christ.”⁸

In another place Justin observes, in an epistle commonly attributed to him :—

“Christians dwell in their own countries, but as foreigners ; they have all things common with other men as fellow-citizens, and yet suffer all things as strangers ; every foreign country is theirs, and every country is foreign to them . . . they are in the flesh, but do not live after the flesh ; they dwell upon earth, but their conversation is in heaven.”⁹

(3.) Tatian, the disciple of Justin Martyr, who subsequently became the founder of an ascetic sect called “the Enekratites,” in his address to the Greeks, observes :—

“Amongst us Christians there is no affectation of vain glory, no diversity of sentiments and opinions ; for having separated ourselves from all worldly pomp and earthly things, and having yielded ourselves entirely to the commands of God to be governed by His laws, we reject everything which seems to belong to human glory.”¹

(4.) Clemens Alexandrinus, once a pagan philosopher, but

⁷ Ignatius to the Ephesians, ch. xiv.

⁸ Justin's *First Apology*, ch. viii.

⁹ Justin, *Epist. to Diognetus*, § 5.

¹ Tatian, *Orat. Contr. Græcos*, ch. xxxii.

subsequently more famous in the better philosophy, who flourished towards the close of the second century, speaks of his fellow-Christians of that age in the following joyous strains :—

“As the fairest possession we give up ourselves entirely to God, loving Him with all our hearts, and reckoning this the chief business of our lives. No man with us is considered a Christian, or reckoned truly rich, unless he be truly religious and sincerely pious. So that this, in short, is the state of those who follow God. Such as are our desires, such are our discourses; such as our discourses, such our actions; such as our actions, such our life; so universally good is the entire life of (Primitive) Christians.”²

And the same author, in another work, when describing the difference between spiritual and earthly things, the latter being so lightly esteemed by the Primitive Christians, says :—

“In the first place, the best beauty is that which is spiritual; for when the soul is adorned with the Holy Spirit, and inspired with the excellent graces which proceed from Him, there is manifested in the Christian the brightest and most lovely ornament that the eye of man can behold, viz., justice, fortitude, and the love of goodness.”³

And in another work attributed to the same author, he observes of his fellow-Christians :—

“Mankind know not what a treasure we bear about us in our earthly vessels—a treasure protected by the power of God the Father, by the blood of God the Son, and by the dew of God the Holy Ghost.”⁴

(5.) Origen, the most distinguished of the pupils of Clement of Alexandria, in his celebrated controversy with Celsus, points out that the Primitive Christians were so careful to avoid all sin, that they kept at a distance from everything which, however lawful in itself, seemed to bear an evil appearance. Hence he remarks :—

“This is the reason why Christians refuse to do anything like paying honour to an image, lest they should give occasion to others to think that they ascribed divinity to them. For this reason they shun all community with the rites and customs of the heathen, abstaining from things strangled or that had been offered to idols, from frequenting the public baths, or going

² Clem. Alex., *Cohort. ad Gentes*, cap. xii.

³ Idem, *Pædag.*, lib. iii. cap. xi.

⁴ Idem, *Quis dives salvetur?* § 39.

to the theatres, *because they seemed to owe their origin to idolatry*, and were the occasion of many gross sins.”⁵

(6.) And so Arnobius, a Christian philosopher, who lived half a century after the time of Origen, in replying to the false accusations which were so frequently made by the heathen against the Primitive Christians, says :—

“ We are accused for introducing profane rites and an impious religion ; but tell me, O ye men of reason, how dare you make so rash a charge ? To adore the mighty God, as the Lord of all, as occupying the highest place in heaven : to pray to Him with respectful submission in our distresses ; to cling to Him with all our senses ; to love Him and to look up to Him is this an execrable and unhallowed religion, polluting by the superstition of its novelty all ancient rites ? We Christians are nothing else than worshippers of the supreme King and Governor of the world, according as we have been taught by our Master Christ Jesus. Search, and you will find nothing else in our religion. This is the sum of all that we do ; this is the proposed end of our duty to God.”⁶

These extracts will sufficiently show the nature of the doctrines held by the Primitive Christians, according to the testimony of those writers who immediately succeeded the age of the Apostles. The practical bearing of these doctrines may be summed up in the statement that they embodied that of the worship of the Trinity in Unity as the sole object of the believer—that they required a complete surrender of the heart to God, avoiding as much as possible the pomps and vanities of the world, and shunning the faintest approach to idolatry, which was in those days “ the prevailing sin of mankind, the great guilt of the age, and almost the sole cause of man being brought into judgment,” as Tertullian expresses it in his great work on that special subject ; for, as he explains—

“ Idolatry robs God, denying Him those honours which are due to Him, and conferring them upon others ; so that at the same time it both defrauds and reproaches God.”⁷

Hence the Church of England, as a faithful witness to

⁵ Origen, *Contr. Cels.*, lib. vii. cap. 66.

⁶ Arnobius, *Adv. Gentes*, lib. i. §§ 25, 27.

⁷ Tertullian, *De Idolat.*, §§ 1 and 11.

primitive truth, thus bears her testimony to one species of idolatry into which multitudes of nominal Christians have fallen ever since the thirteenth century, when the Church of Rome decreed that—

“The body and blood of Christ are contained really in the sacrament of the altar, under the species of bread and wine; the bread being transubstantiated into the body of Jesus Christ, and the wine into His blood, by the power of God.”⁸

Which doctrine of Transubstantiation the Church of Rome again confirmed three and a half centuries later, by decreeing that, in consequence of the bread and wine being transubstantiated into the body and blood of Christ,—

“All the faithful, according to the custom *ever received* in the (Roman) Catholic Church, exhibit in veneration the worship of LATRIA, which is due to the true God, to this most holy sacrament.”⁹

To this the Church of England faithfully replies by affirming authoratively—

“That no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental Bread or Wine there bodily received, or unto any Corporal presence of Christ’s natural Flesh and Blood. For the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored; for that were Idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians.”¹

⁸ Decree of the Fourth Council of Lateran, c. i., held by Pope Innocent III., A.D. 1215.

⁹ Council of Trent, sess. xiii. c. v.

¹ Book of Common Prayer. Rubric at the end of the Communion Service, or “The Order of the Administration of the Lord’s Supper, or Holy Communion.” It should be remembered that the words “unto any Corporal presence of Christ’s natural Flesh and Blood,” as they now stand in the Rubric, read before the revision of 1661 “unto any real and essential presence of Christ there being.”

CHAPTER III.

THE PRACTICE OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.

WHEN we consider the practice of the Primitive Christians in respect to the mode and order of worship, we see at once not only how simple and becoming such worship was to those who had given up the world for the sake of Christ, and who by their mutual actions of kindness and charity amongst themselves had elicited from their heathen persecutors the common saying, "See how these Christians love one another;" but also how marked the distinction, how wide the gulf between the practice of these followers of the meek and lowly Jesus and that of the Church of Rome, or of those who delight in closely imitating her in all that relates to the pomps and vanities of this giddy world.

It is not many years ago that the most powerful reflector of public opinion which the world has ever seen thus expressed itself respecting the mode of conducting worship as then practised in many of our churches, and which have considerably increased, both in number and pomp, since the *Times* thought fit to call attention to the subject in the following way:—

"Notwithstanding the remonstrances of archbishops and bishops, the Ritualists still continue, and even increase, their extravagances. The churches which were so notorious last spring are equally notorious still, and a visit to such a place as St. Alban's, Holborn, on the occasion of what is called high service, is still sufficient to startle even the most tolerant of ordinary Churchmen. Priests, as they delight to call themselves, in defiance of the most judicious of English divines, are conspicuous in dresses unknown to the English eye for three hundred years. Three of these personages, bedizened with green and gold and yellow, and covered with black stripes and crosses, stand with their backs to the congregation on the elevated steps at the east end of the church. The altar is overladen with *gorgeous ornaments*, and illuminated at noon-day with two great lighted

candles. Pyramids of tapers, such as are seen in Roman Catholic churches, are placed at each side. The chancel is emblazoned with tinsel banners, and the white surplices of the choristers are the only things in the *gaudy spectacle* which could remind one of the customary ritual of the English Church. Here, across an atmosphere which is faint with the odours of incense, the *green and gilded priests* are dimly discerned performing unintelligible manœuvres—bowing, and bending, and turning, and crossing from side to side, until the recitation of the words of the service becomes the smallest part of their functions. Two white-dressed attendants carry a silver censer, from which the fumes of the incense are incessantly tossed, now over the altar, now over the book from which the gospel is read, and now into the faces of all the performers in the chancel. These glaring dresses and elaborate ceremonials are simply the relics of less civilized times, and the very vestments in which these ecclesiastical performers flaunt, and to which they attach such ridiculous importance, have been shown to be nothing but ornamented varieties of the usual garments of the time of the Roman Empire. To make a point of reintroducing these gilded ornaments three centuries after they have been disused, would, in any other profession, be despicable childishness; but to force them into prominence, and make them of importance amid the solemn realities of religion, is simply revolting to a reverent mind. It would be idle any longer to disguise the fact that these Ritualists are openly teaching doctrines which are barely distinguishable from extreme Roman Catholicism, and are in flat contradiction to the most cherished tenets of Anglicanism. . . . The all-but avowed object is to make the English Communion service as like the Roman Catholic mass as possible; and, in point of fact, any one who has seen high mass in a Roman Catholic church, has seen the high service at St. Alban's. *This gilt ginger-bread school*, as it was long ago described by Dr. Newman, is developing a systematic revival of that Romanizing movement which was checked by public indignation more than twenty years ago. The other objectionable practices of Roman Catholicism are naturally introduced along with its leading tenet. . . . It is ridiculous to plead that these new-fangled practices are popular. In point of fact, they are only popular among a class; but if a clergyman were to preach Mohammedanism and declare it was Anglicanism, he would no doubt find followers, and have some ground for the customary excuse that he was meeting a want of the day. The supposed use of bishops and articles is to see that people are taught, not what they like, but what is good for them. It is time this pernicious nonsense was stopped, and whatever the noise which these innovators might make, the authorities of the Church would have the general support of the English people, if they would but summon up resolution to do their duty."²

² The *Times*, Oct. 19th, 1866.

Now let any one contrast such practices by persons supposed to be engaged in the worship of that Unseen Being, who, as Revelation teaches, is a "Spirit," and who requires those that worship Him to do so "in spirit and in truth," with the simple practice of the Primitive Christian when similarly engaged.

(1.) Clemens Romanus, who is mentioned by St. Paul in Philippians, (iv. 3,) and was, therefore, a contemporary of the Apostles, is the earliest evidence we have of the practice of the Christians in their public services. The little he says on the subject is contained in the following passage :—

"Since we look into the depths of the divine knowledge, it behoves us to do all things in order, which the Lord has commanded us to perform at stated times. For He requires offerings and service to be performed, not thoughtlessly or irregularly, but at the appointed times and seasons. Where and by whom He desires these things to be done, He Himself has fixed by His own supreme will, in order that all things being piously done according to His good pleasure may be acceptable to Him."³

(2.) Justin Martyr describes the worship practised in the second century in the following simple terms :—

"On the day called Sunday, all who live in towns or the country assemble in one place, where the memoirs of the Apostles and the writings of the Prophets are read, as long as time permits; then, when the reader has ceased, the president verbally instructs and exhorts the people to practise such good things. Then we all rise together and pray, and when prayer is ended, bread and wine and water are brought, and the president in like manner offers prayers and thanksgivings, as each one is able, to which the congregation say *Amen*; and there is a distribution to every one present of the consecrated food, while to the absent a portion is sent by the deacons. Those who are rich and willing give what each thinks fit; and the collection is deposited with the president, who succours the orphans and widows, and those who, through sickness or any other cause, are in want, and prisoners and strangers sojourning amongst us; in a word, he provides for all who are in need."⁴

There are two things to note in Justin's account, showing a slight divergence, unhappily the commencement of far greater changes, on the part of those Christians of the second century

³ Clem. Rom., *Epist. to Corinthians*, ch. 40.

⁴ Justin Mar., *Apology*, i. ch. 66.

from the practice of their predecessors, to whom the name of "Primitive" more especially belongs, viz., in the mixing water with wine at the administration of the Lord's Supper; and also in sending the consecrated elements to those who could not be present at the assembly of the brethren. It is scarcely necessary to say that on these two points there is no scriptural warrant for such a practice, inasmuch as the New Testament is altogether silent on both subjects; but inasmuch as some amongst ourselves are endeavouring to introduce these rites, we may appropriately consider if anything can be said in their favour.

1st. As regards mingling water with the wine at the Lord's Supper, commonly known by the term "the mixed chalice," some contend, that although it is true Scripture only mentions "bread and wine" at the institution, and again when St. Paul describes what he had "received of the Lord" in his account of the sacred rite, (1 Cor. xi. 23—26,) that "the cup" meant to include water as well as "wine," as it is said the Jews invariably mingled water with the wine used at the Paschal feast, therefore it behoves all Christians to do the same. Passing by the very natural reply that this makes our blessed Redeemer's teaching and practice yield to what is supposed to have been the custom of the Jews at a feast under the old dispensation, and which was about to be abolished by the introduction of a new and better way, it is by no means certain that Dr. Pusey, who contends strongly for this custom, is correct in this statement. It appears from testimonies collected by Buxtorf, Schöttgen, and Lightfoot, that this was not necessarily the case. The latter, although concluding, contrary to the letter of Scripture, that our Lord mingled water with wine at the institution of the Lord's Supper, shows that all Jews, when partaking of the Paschal feast, men, women, and children alike, were compelled to drink a certain portion of unmixed pure red wine. Hence the saying found in the Talmud, "If any one drinks the wine pure, *i.e.*, unmixed with water, he hath performed his duty."⁵

⁵ Lightfoot's *Hebrew and Talmudical Exercitations in St. Matthew*, ch. xxvi. 27, § v.

It is true that some Christians, with whom Justin worshipped in the middle of the second century, were accustomed to mix water with the cup at the Lord's Supper, possibly with the idea that it more exactly represented the "blood and water" which issued from our Lord's side, but we have no warrant for asserting that it was then a universal custom; and there is reason to believe, from the controversy which arose about the same time as to the correct mode of keeping Easter,⁶ in which the Church of Rome differed materially from the custom of those Churches which had so long enjoyed the personal superintendence of the Apostle John, that the Churches of Asia adhered to the primitive practice of using the unmixed cup at the Lord's Supper. This custom is most harmless in itself, so long as it is done by lawful authority, as in the case of the Greek and Latin Churches. There is, however, this difference in their rules respecting it. In the Roman Churches, the mixing water at the Eucharist takes place only *once*; in the Oriental Churches, it is done *twice*. First, before the consecration of the elements with *cold* water; secondly, after the consecration with *warm* water, which is considered as the combined emblem of the water from our Lord's side and the fire of the Holy Ghost.

⁶ Irenæus, when reproving Pope Victor, A.D. 180, for his haughty and schismatical conduct, mentions how differently was the action of his predecessor, Pope Anicetus, about thirty years before, when the Easter controversy first arose. His words are:—"When the blessed Polycarp went to Rome in the time of Anicetus, and they had a little difference among themselves respecting other matters, they were soon reconciled, not disputing much with one another. For neither could Anicetus persuade Polycarp to observe it as he did, because *Polycarp had always observed it with John, the disciple of our Lord, and the rest of the Apostles with whom he associated*; but neither could Polycarp persuade Anicetus to observe it as he did, for Anicetus argued that *he was bound to maintain the practice of the presbyters before him*. Which things being so, they held communion with each other; and in the Church, *Anicetus yielded to Polycarp*, out of respect, no doubt, *the office of consecrating*, and they separated from each other in peace, all the Church being at peace; both those that observed it, and those that did not observe it, maintaining peace."--Irenæus' *Epistle to Victor*, given by Eusebius, *Eccles. Hist.*, lib. v. 24.

The Church of England, however, after the example of our blessed Lord, and the practice of the Christians of the first century, only permits "wine," and forbids mixing water with it at the celebration of the Lord's Supper. This has been decided by the authority of the Supreme Ordinary of our Church in the well-known case of *HEBBERT v. PURCHAS*, that whatever early authority may be adduced in its favour, it is clearly not lawful according to the order of the Reformed Church of England, and this, which is really of such trifling moment, every loyal Churchman will readily obey.

After the *Purchas* case had been argued in the lower court, and the Dean of Arches confined the prohibition of mixing water with the wine "during the celebration of the Holy Communion, and as part of the ceremonial thereof," it was thought by some that it might be lawfully done before the commencement of the service. But this was set aside by the judgment of the higher court, which very pointedly pronounced against such a practice in the following way:—

"Their lordships are unable to arrive at the conclusion that if the mingling and administering in the service water and wine is an additional ceremony, and so unlawful, it becomes lawful by removing from the service the act of mingling, but keeping the mingled cup itself and administering it. But neither Eastern nor Western Church, so far as the committee is aware, has any custom of mixing the water with wine apart from and before the service."⁷

As this opinion has been confirmed by the Supreme Ordinary,⁸ and is, therefore, and will continue so to be until

⁷ *Law Journal Report*, vol. xl. pt. 6, June, 1871, p. 49.

⁸ It has been ruled by the law of England, in *Grendon's case*, 18, 19 Elizabeth, (see Plowden, 498,) that "the sovereign is *Supreme Ordinary*, as having received, by the Act of Henry VIII. 26. c. 1, all the power which the Pope had before exercised as *Supreme Ordinary*." Hence the late Archdeacon Hale, in his work on *The Supremacy of the Crown*, justly observed: "Over all the bishops the law of England has established a Supreme Ordinary in the person of the sovereign." And that every clergyman is pledged in the most solemn way to obey this "Supreme Ordinary," is evident from the vows which he makes when called upon to exercise his ministry in the Church of England,—“That the Queen's Majesty under God is the

reversed by the same authority, the law of both the land and the Church, it is with no little surprise that we find the Bishop of Newfoundland writing to the *Guardian*, a few months later, in the following way :—

“ *One hardly likes to appear to sanction such a suggestion ; but suppose, without enquiring into the reason or object, a little water be put into the chalice before it is carried to the holy table, the priest may pour wine into the cup for consecration. No one save the person who put the water into the chalice, and the priest who poured wine into it, would know that there was any mixing or uniting at all.*”

Surely the bishop must have forgotten the Eye of Omniscience when penning so extraordinary an epistle, in support of what must appear to every candid Christian not unlike that system of “deceit” against which the Apostle so earnestly warned the Primitive Christians at Rome. The *Daily News* appears to have taken this view, as it writes on this painful subject as follows :—

“As there is a time so there is a place for all things, and to right-minded people we believe there are few things more repugnant than the introduction into sacred subjects of that extreme ingenuity of device which we pardon in a wretch who is fighting for his life at the Old Bailey. Whether the ingenuity of a prelate of the Anglican Church, whose communication appears in the current number of the *Guardian*, is of this type, we leave our readers to consider. We are not surprised that the bishop ‘hardly likes to appear’ to sanction such a suggestion ; *but it is the appearance only, from*

only supreme governor of this realm, as well in all *spiritual* or ecclesiastical things or causes as temporal.” The supremacy of the Queen in all *spiritual* causes is set forth in the *Canons* of the Church of England in these words :—“That the Queen’s power is the highest under God ; to whom all men do, by God’s laws, owe most *loyalty and obedience*, above all other powers and potentates.” (*Canon I.*) Mr. Machonochie’s understanding of his vows is seen in the fact, that when condemned by the “Supreme Ordinary” at his first trial, he immediately published an address to his congregation containing these words :—“*We do not mean to obey* (the law,) and, if God gives us grace to do so, will meet any punishment *rather than obey.*” It is difficult to know how any minister of Christ can reconcile such defiance of the law with the apostolic command, as set forth in the Word of God—“*Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves.*” (Hebrews xiii. 17.)

which he shrinks; the suggestion itself he not only appears to sanction, but adopts. We should like some of these over-zealous and very clear men to consider whether these holy mysteries could be less honoured if they were suspended altogether, than they must be if they are brought before the public as occasions for the display of clerical ingenuity in palming off a deceit upon the trusting multitude."

2nd. With reference to the reserved sacrament for the purpose of sending it to the sick members, who are necessarily prevented from being present in church, although Justin Martyr tells us it was the custom in his day with his fellow-worshippers, it must have been a very different thing from what it has assumed in modern times in the Church of Rome. And hence our Church has very properly forbidden it, by requiring the officiating minister to consume all that remains of the bread and wine after the communicants have partaken. The Church of Rome adopts an opposite course, and requires that every knee should bow to the consecrated wafer as it is carried along the streets to the sick and dying, which we pronounce to be "idolatry to be abhorred by all faithful Christians." This is carried to such a ludicrous and profane extent, that whenever the bell, which rings as the wafer is carried through the streets, is heard to tinkle, every one leaves his occupation in order to adore the passing idol.

"As an officer's guard," says a Spanish writer, "is always stationed at the door of a Spanish theatre, I have often laughed in my sleeve at the effect of the bell both upon the actors and the company. '*The God! The God!*' resounds from all parts of the house, and every one falls that moment upon his knees. The actor's ranting, or the rattling of the *castanets* in the fandango, is hushed for a few minutes, till, the sound of the bell growing fainter and fainter, the amusement is resumed, and the devout performers are on their legs to make amends for the interruption."

* Doblado's *Letters from Spain*, p. 12. Contrast such conduct on the part of these devotees of the Roman Church with that of the Primitive Christians in respect to their attendance at the theatres and spectacles, as related by an eminent member of the same church seventeen centuries ago, when, as St. Paul tells us, "her faith was spoken of throughout the whole world." Tertullian, after vigorously condemning such customs as being peculiarly unsuitable to the Christians, and also grossly immoral, says,

Such is the “histrionic” religion, to use Dr. Littledale’s expression, which our Ritualistic brethren are now endeavouring to seduce Protestant Churchmen to accept; as I recollect reading a sermon preached at St. Alban’s about two years ago, in which the preacher advocated a similar practice in the streets of London, with the reiterated assurance that it would be very effective for the people to witness what he described by the term “*Jesus passeth by.*” And though Mr. Bennett of Frome, in his evidence before the Ritual Commissioners, stated that he considered the reservation of the Sacrament distinctly prohibited by the English Church, on “Good Friday” of 1873 an eye-witness states that the clergy and choir as they entered made not their usual *bows* to the Lord’s table at the east end of the chancel, but a real genuflexion towards the so-called “altar in St. Andrew’s Chapel,” in which there was “*a reserved sacrament from the Thursday in Passion week till Easter-day, with perpetual adoration,*”—i.e., one or more persons continually kneeling in adoration during the whole of the time that the sacrament was exposed on the “altar.”

Earnestness in prayer was another characteristic mark of the Primitive Christians, not only in their public, but also in their private and family devotions; such as we may suppose was the practice of the great leader of the children of Israel on their entrance into the land of promise, as Joshua expressed himself, “As for me and my house, we will serve the Lord.” Eusebius relates of “James, the Lord’s brother,” as St. Paul calls him, who presided at the Council of Jerusalem, that he was accustomed to go every day alone into the place where the Christians assembled, and there kneeling upon the pavement so long in pouring out his prayers to God, that at length his knees

“Why may not those who go into the temptations of the show become accessible also to evil spirits? We have the case of the woman—the Lord Himself is witness—who went to the theatre and came back possessed. Accordingly, when the unclean spirit was cast out and upbraided with having dared to attack a believer, he at once replied, with justice, ‘*In truth I did it most righteously, for I found her in my own domain.*’” (*De Spectaculis*, § 4.)

became as hard and brawny as a camel's."¹ A similar anecdote is related of the saintly John Fletcher, Vicar of Madeley, in the last century, and a bosom friend of John Wesley, that the mortar of that part of the wall in his chamber against which he daily knelt when engaged in prayer, fell down after his death from the effect of his pious breathings, which were poured forth with so much fervour, and who, of all men that John Wesley ever knew, came nearest in piety and holiness to that of the Primitive Christians.

As regards a form of prayer or "liturgy" in use amongst the Christians of Apostolic times, and to which St. Paul is supposed to allude when he exhorts his young friend to "hold fast the form of sound words, which thou has heard of me, in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus," (2 Tim. i. 13,) it is known that, previous to the Christian era, and until the time of the destruction of the Temple at Jerusalem, the daily prayers in use for the Temple service consisted of eighteen in number, all of which were reduced for convenience sake to one single brief form, containing the marrow of them all, which every Jew was expected to use. The president at its commencement called the people to prayer, just as the minister does in the service of the Church of England, in the following way:—

"Thou hast loved us, O Lord God, with an everlasting love; with great and abundant compassion hast Thou pitied us, O our Father and our King, for our fathers' sake, who trusted in Thee, and Thou taughtest them the studies of life. So be gracious to us also, O our Father most merciful, have pity on us. And put into our hearts to know, understand, obey, learn, teach, observe, do, and perform all the words of the doctrine of Thy law in love; and enlighten our eyes by Thy law, and cause our hearts to cleave to Thy commandments, and unite our hearts to love and fear Thy name."²

Hence our blessed Lord's command, "After this manner pray ye," so familiar to us as "The Lord's Prayer," a large portion of which Lightfoot³ shows must have been known to

¹ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.*, lib. ii. cap. 23.

² *The Temple Service*. By Dr. John Lightfoot, ch. ix. § 4.

³ Lightfoot's *Exercitationes upon St. Matthew* vi. 9; and Sermon on St. Luke xi. 2.

the Jews, as having been long in use in their public service. No sooner was the Church of Christ formed on the day of Pentecost than we hear of the disciples uniting together in public prayer and thanksgiving on the occasion of the release of St. Peter and John from the power of the chief priests at Jerusalem, as it is written, "When they heard that, they lifted up their voice to God *with one accord*,"⁴ &c., which these Primitive Christians scarcely could have done had they not then been in possession of some recognised form of prayer.

And so with the Church of Antioch, not many years after the incident just mentioned, as it is said of Barnabas and Saul, previous to their being separated by the Holy Ghost for special missionary work, that they with other brethren "*ministered* to the Lord and fasted."⁵ Now the exact meaning of the word translated by the well-known term "ministered" (*litourgountone*) is this — "performing the office of praying;" and hence the term "liturgy," which is derived from *lite*, "prayer," and *ergon*, "work" or "service." Such being the work on which the Apostles Barnabas and Paul, with others of the Church at Antioch, were engaged, we may consider whether there is any reason for supposing that any portion of the various ancient liturgies which have come down to us could have existed as early as the middle of the first century of the Christian era.⁶ Although it is uncertain, as one learned writer⁷ on liturgies confesses, when they were first committed to writing, and speaks of the liturgy in the "Apostolical Constitutions," as not having been drawn up before the end of the

⁴ Acts iv. 24.

⁵ Acts xiii. 1, 2.

⁶ From Justin Martyr's account of the worship of Christians in the middle of the second century, we learn that the order of the public service was as follows:—1. The reading of Scripture, both Old and New Testament. 2nd. Sermon. 3rd. Liturgical Prayer. 4th. Extempore Prayer by the presiding minister. 5th. The Lord's Supper, with the Offertory and sending the bread and wine which had been consecrated to the sick, who were unable to attend the service. (*Apology*, i. c. 66.)

⁷ Palmer's *Origines Liturgicæ*, p. 11.

third century, and another⁸ is content with assuming the possibility of "The Liturgy of St. James" having been composed as to its main fabric before the end of the second century, there appears to be some reason for thinking that one portion may possibly have been as old as the days of the Apostles: *e.g.*, St. Paul, in writing to the Corinthians, (1 Ep. ii. 9,) is represented as saying, "But, as it is written, eye hath not seen," &c. To what passage in the Old Testament could he have referred "It is written?" It is generally supposed that he is there quoting Isaiah lxiv. 4; but St. Paul begins the quotation, omitted in the Authorised Version, "*which* eye hath not seen," &c., showing that there must have been an antecedent. Any one who carefully compares the Septuagint Version of Isaiah lxiv. 4, with the Greek of 1 Cor. ii. 9, will see that there is not a single word exactly alike in the two passages; and also that Isaiah omits the word "*which*," just as our Authorised Version. But it is a fact that the exact words used by St. Paul, which he says is a quotation from some other writing, are to be found in the "Liturgy of St. James" as it now stands; from which we infer that a portion of it was composed by the Apostle whose name it bears as early as A.D. 59, when St. Paul's first Epistle was supposed to have been written. The words as they now stand in the liturgy termed that of St. James, read as a prayer, expressed in the following beautiful language:—

"Beseeching Thee that Thou wouldest not deal with us after our sins, nor reward us according to our iniquities; but according to Thy gentleness and measureless love passing over and blotting out the handwriting against us, Thy supplicants, Thou wouldest bestow on us Thy heavenly and eternal gifts, which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man the things which Thou, O God, hath prepared for them that love Thee."

Thus much for the evidence we have respecting the worship of the early Christians of the first century. Of their immediate successors of the second century Pliny mentions, when recording the customs of Christians at the beginning of the second

⁸ Neale's *Introduction to the History of the Eastern Church*, p. 319.

century, that they were accustomed to “meet on a certain day before light, and sing hymns alternately to Christ as God,” (*carmen dicere*.) The expression used by Pliny is used by Latin authors to signify “a solemn form of prayer,” as well as of praise. Hence Socrates,⁹ the ecclesiastical historian, speaks of Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, at the very time of which Pliny was writing, as having introduced into the Church the mode of singing alternately to the praise and glory of the Divine Trinity. And so Eusebius,¹ when mentioning the heresy of Artemon, says, “From the beginning there were psalms and hymns composed by the brethren and written by the faithful, setting forth the praises of Christ as the Word of God, and declaring the divinity of His person.”

(2.) We have already adduced the testimony of Justin Martyr ; and Irenæus,² Bishop of Lyons, who lived in the close of the second century, takes notice of certain forms of prayer then in use amongst the Primitive Christians. And Clemens Alexandrinus,³ his contemporary, says, when speaking of the Church, that “It was the congregation of those who prostrated themselves in prayer, having as it were one common voice ;” which implies that their prayers were such as they could join vocally in them under a well-known form, either by repeating the whole, or at least by alternate responses.

(3.) Origen, at the beginning of the thirteenth century, expressly mentions one of the prayers in constant use amongst Christians, to the following effect :—

“Grant us, O Almighty God, a part with Thy prophets ; grant us a part with the Apostles of Thy Christ ; grant that we may ever be found adoring Thy only begotten Son.”⁴

(4.) And Cyprian, his contemporary, testifies not only that

⁹ Socrates, *Eccles. Hist.*, lib. vi. cap. 8.

¹ Eusebius, *Eccles. Hist.*, lib. v. cap. 28. Eusebius has preserved the fragments of Caius' (a Roman Presbyter) work, entitled *The Labyrinth*, written against Artemon, one of the first who denied Christ's godhead.

² Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, lib. i. cap. 1.

³ Clem. Alex., *Strommata*, lib. vii. cap. 6.

⁴ Origen, *Homily 11 in Jerem.*

"the Lord's Prayer" was in common use as a spiritual form most acceptable to God, but also specifies several forms of prayer in use amongst his fellow-Christians. Thus, as an instance, in the administration of the Lord's Supper, he mentions that the officiating minister uses the following exhortation, so familiar to the ears of members of the Church of England, "Lift up your hearts;" to which the congregation reply, "We lift them up unto the Lord." The minister continues, "Let us give thanks to our Lord God;" to which they respond, "It is just and right so to do." Then followed the Consecration Prayer, and the Lord's Prayer; and after that the salutation, "Peace be with you;" to which the people answered, "And with thy spirit." Then followed the administration of the Holy Communion, and the congregation departed.⁵

But as well as forms of prayer or "liturgies" being in use amongst the Primitive Christians in their public assemblies, and to which we must suppose was added the privilege of "extempore prayer," as occasion required, we have ample evidence that the Holy Scriptures were also read publicly after a prescribed "lectionary," not unlike the order of our Reformed Church, as Augustine clearly shows.⁶ The Primitive Christians had the highest authority for regarding Scripture with the most profound reverence, for they not only had St. Paul's testimony that it was "able to make men wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ,"⁷ but they had been taught by the same authority that it was their bounden duty to test everything they heard, whether preached by an angel from heaven, an inspired apostle, or a holy missionary, by the only infallible

⁵ Theodoret, *Hæret. Fabul.*, lib. iv. cap. i., when mentioning the form of prayer in the Baptismal service in use in his day, relates that Arius, "transgressing the ancient laws of giving glory to God, which had been handed down by those who lived and served in the ministry of the word from the beginning, introduced a new form of prayer, teaching those whom he deceived to say, Glory be to the Father, *by* the Son, and *in* the Holy Ghost."

⁶ *Exposit. in Joan, in Præfat.*

⁷ 2 Tim. iii. 15.

touchstone which God had given to man, viz., the Scriptures themselves; and in which the way of life and holiness is so plainly revealed, that "the wayfaring men, though fools" in the world's estimation, "shall not err therein."⁸ This is clearly revealed in the conduct of the noble Bereans, who had tested the preaching of the Apostle in that very way, and were highly commended for so doing. "These (Bereans) were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so."⁹ Here we have inspired authority and a divine command to exercise the right of private judgment, which all the pretended claims of the Church of Rome can never controvert.

(1.) Thus, to quote a few extracts out of the multitude at hand on this point from the writings of the Primitive Christians, we see Irenæus in the second century teaching as follows:—

"We have known the method of our salvation by no others than those by whom the Gospel came to us; which Gospel the Apostles then truly preached; but afterwards, by the will of God, they delivered it to us in the Scriptures, which then became the foundation and pillar of our faith."¹

(2.) Tertullian, the contemporary of Ignatius, says on the same subject—

"I adore the fulness of Scripture. Let the school of Hermogenes show that it is written. If it be not written, let them fear that woe which is destined for them that add or take away therefrom."²

(3.) Origen interprets the teaching of Scripture on this point in the following warning:—

"Consider what imminent danger they are in who neglect to study the Scriptures, in which alone a knowledge of their condition can be ascertained."³

(4.) Eusebius, Bishop of Cæsarea, delivered this solemn

⁸ Isa. xxxv. 8.

⁹ Acts xxvii. 11. Compare Gal. i. 6—9.

¹ Irenæus, *Adv. Hæc.*, lib. iii. cap. iii. § 1.

² Tertullian, *Adv. Hermog.*, cap. xxii.

³ Origen, *Homil.* 25 in *Matt.*

injunction, which as truly deserved the name of "Catholic" as any other in the annals of the Ancient Church, in the name of the three hundred and eighteen bishops assembled at the Council of Nice :—

"Believe the things that are written in the Scriptures: the things that are not written, neither think upon nor enquire after."⁴

(5.) Augustine very clearly points out the duty of Christians in respect to the infallible testimony of Scripture, and contrasts it with the uselessness of adducing the authority of any council, whether general or otherwise, in contrast to or in explanation of anything to be gathered from the revealed word of God, as so many in the present day appear inclined to do. His words are very important on this point, and therefore deserving of the closest consideration by those who wish to understand what Christians, as late as the close of the fourth century, held and taught on this point. He says :—

"I ought not to adduce the Council of Nice, nor ought you to adduce the Council of Ariminum, for I am not bound by the one, nor you by the other. Let the question be determined by the authority of the Scriptures, which are witnesses peculiar to neither of us, but common to both."⁵

And in another place the same author, after the example of St. Paul as he followed Christ, says distinctly :—

"If an angel from heaven shall have preached to you anything beyond what ye have received in the Scriptures of the Law and the Gospel, let him be accursed."⁶

We may judge from these testimonies how fully the Primitive Christians realized this fine saying concerning Holy Scripture, that every sentence of it comes from God, and every individual is interested in the meaning thereof. Like the heathen fable of a golden chain suspending the world from the throne of Jove, every sentence of God's word is a link in that more precious chain of gold which binds all the faithful to the heart of God.

⁴ *Concil. General at Provinc.*, t. i. lib. ii. cap. 19. Colon. 1618.

⁵ Augustine, *Contr. Max.*, ii. 14.

⁶ Augustine, *Contr. Petit.*, iii. 6.

If we leave Scripture in order to take up with the writings of fallible men, however devout and earnest, it is like Adam's expulsion from Paradise to till the ground full of thorns and thistles, from which food can only be extracted with labour and toil. Thus these Holy Scriptures, the sacred oracles of the one only God, are the true golden mines in which alone the lasting treasures of eternity are to be found. How little do many readers of the Bible, in this present age of luxury, when every one is free to reject or accept its claims to our obedience, remember what it cost the Primitive Christians, especially during the Diocletian persecution, merely to rescue and hide copies of the sacred Scriptures from the rage of the heathen. In that fresh morning hour of the Church there belonged to the sincere followers of Christ a fulness of faith in the realities of the unseen world, such as, in later days, has been reached only by a very few eminent individuals. As it has been well said of these Primitive Christians, "*the many* felt a persuasion, which is now only experienced *by the few*."

With the knowledge, therefore, that these Holy Scriptures contain everything necessary for man to know and by man to be performed, one of the first signs of the movement of the Spirit in the Church of Christ during the darkness of the middle ages, when the grossest fables of superstition supplanted the Word of Life, and which culminated in the glorious Reformation of the sixteenth century, was the endeavour so universally made by all the Churches of Western Europe, which had been brought out from that worse than Egyptian darkness which had overspread so large a portion of Christendom, to provide the people with copies of the Scriptures, so that they might be enabled to read God's message of love to a lost world—"every man in our own tongue in which we were born." Hence our own favoured branch of Christ's Catholic Church on earth, first and foremost in this blessed work and labour of love, truly asserts in the Preface to the Authorised Version, that every fresh instance of spreading far and wide the knowledge of Christ and Him crucified through the dissemination of the Scriptures is simply—"opening the window to let in the

light ; breaking the shell that we may eat the kernel ; putting aside the curtain that we may look into the most holy place ; removing the cover from the well that we may come and taste of the waters of life, and drink largely, and live for evermore."

But it never should be forgotten that it is not the mere possession of these Holy Scriptures, nor even our diligent study of them, that constitutes our safety, without the guidance of the Holy Spirit to direct us to a right understanding thereof. The fatal mistake of the "wise of this world," as they are termed—of those who are content with natural in place of spiritual religion—may be summed up in that expressive sentence, "With the heart man believeth, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." Those who are unable to see the fundamental doctrines of our religion, such as ruin by the fall, redemption by Christ, and regeneration by the Spirit, which the Primitive Christians held so clearly and faithfully, place naturally the head and intellect as foremost in their standard of religious truth. But in order to make the wisdom of Scripture our wisdom, its spirit our spirit, and its language our best loved and best understood language, there must be a higher influence upon the soul than what lies in human skill or human explanation. Until this is brought to pass, the doctrine of conversion, and the doctrine of the atonement and the resurrection, and the doctrine of fellowship with the Father and the Son, and the doctrine of the believer's progressive holiness under the moral and spiritual power of the "truth as in Jesus," will, as to his own personal experience of its meaning, remain so many hidden mysteries, or so many hidden sounds.

CHAPTER IV.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.

IN the last chapter we have omitted that important portion of public worship amongst the Primitive Christians, known by the familiar name of "the Sermon," because it will have to be noticed at length in this present chapter, which treats exclusively of the doctrine held and taught by them, upon the principle of the celebrated canon mentioned by Tertullian more than once in the course of his writings, to this effect: "*That which was first is true; that which came after is false,*"⁷—a golden rule, which it behoves us ever to remember, especially as in the present day we see it so completely set aside by those who are never tired of boasting that their doctrines and practices are in accordance with what they call, "Primitive and Catholic truth."

All Christians, of all ages, are unanimous as to the duty of "preaching;" but the question to be considered is this:—What were the doctrines which the Primitive Christians believed and preached, and which it behoves us to do the same in the present day? One word may be sufficient to express the fundamental truth on which all effectual preaching of the Gospel must rest, and concerning which St. Paul denounced such a woe against himself if he preached it not, viz.:—THE DOCTRINE OF THE CROSS. But this very term is so misunderstood and misapplied by many in the present day, that it will require a careful analysis in order to see what it was that the Primitive Christians held and taught on this all-important truth.

In Holy Scripture, the term "the Cross" is used in a two-fold sense—literally and figuratively. In the former instance, it means the instrument for the capital punishment of the vilest

⁷ Tertullian, *Adv. Prac.*, § 2, and *Præscrip. adv. Her.*, § 31.

of malefactors ; in the latter, it means the doctrine of atonement, which the Son of God once made when He died on the cross of Calvary. Literally, it signifies the most ignominious of gibbets ; figuratively, it is the most glorious of truths. We need not wonder then at finding how this term has been misunderstood, when the word bears such very different meanings. On the one hand, the unbelieving Jews identifying the figurative with the literal—the doctrine of the Cross with the cross itself, have enlarged on the disgrace of the Crucified One, and thrown it contemptuously in the teeth of His disciples. On the other hand, superstitious and mistaken Christians, such as existed amongst the Galatians in Apostolic times, and amongst Romanists and Romanisers in our own day, identifying the literal with the figurative—the cross with the doctrine, have elevated the material figure into the place of the spiritual truth ; and have gradually turned it into an object of idolatry, just as the faithless Jews treated “ the brazen serpent that Moses had made,” when they “ burnt incense ” to what God had originally given as a blessing, which the pious King of Israel very righteously brake in pieces, and termed it in derision, *Nehushtan*—“ a piece of brass.”

It behoves us, therefore, to remember the vast distinction, the wide gulf, so powerful in its action, and so fatal in its results, between the doctrine of the Cross as understood by the Primitive Christians, and the material cross as paraded so publicly by the superstitious multitude in the present day. The teaching of St. Paul, as declared in his various Epistles, especially the First to the Corinthians and that to the Galatians, shows this in a most unmistakable way. The preaching of the Cross was to the Jew and to the Greek, who delighted in visible sacrifices—the former of which were commanded by Jehovah, and which were proper until the coming of Christ to make the one great sacrifice of Himself, which never could be repeated ; the latter in those useless sacrifices, which were the natural development of his unsanctified mind—while to the faithful Christian, not only of primitive times, but of all ages, it was essentially “ the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth ; to the Jew

first, and also to the Greek.”⁸ Hence St. Paul summarises the whole of this precious doctrine in that fine outburst of spiritual teaching:—“God forbid that I should glory save in the Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified to me, and I unto the world. For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature.”⁹

St. Paul here tells the Galatians what some “false brethren” amongst the Primitive Christians had “unawares brought in;” and he contrasts it with what he, as a teacher sent from God, was inspired to glorify in. They gloried in the old rites and ceremonies of the Jewish law, such as ornaments, and splendid decorations of their synagogues, gorgeous vestments, smoking incense, prostrations and genuflexions, elevations of consecrated things, much washings and unscriptural fastings,¹ a material altar and a daily sacrifice—all of which were but *types* and *shadows* of better things to come, and were done away by the promulgation of the Gospel; while he gloried solely in the *substance*, *i.e.*, in Jesus Christ and Him crucified, as the only Way, the Truth, and the Life. He knew it was an affront to his Master to continue these shadows, after the substance had appeared. Therefore, he condemned the unlawful practices of the Galatian Christians, zealous as they probably were, but certainly not according to knowledge; at the same time he confined his own glorying to that one blessed object, which the eye of faith alone could discern, and to which all the shadows were designed to point, and exclaims in the exuberance of his spiritual joy,—“God forbid that I should glory, save in the Cross (not of any human manufacture, but) of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world.”

Here the Apostle shows us both his high esteem of the Cross

⁸ Rom. i. 16.

⁹ Gal. vi. 14, 15.

¹ Contrast what is said in the 58th chapter of Isaiah respecting a fast which is acceptable to God, and the practice of the superstitious Jews in ancient times, and their equally superstitious successors of the Roman Church in the present day.

of Christ, and the powerful influence it had upon his mind in the crucifixion of self during his pilgrimage on earth. Thus the Cross of Christ spoken of by St. Paul denotes clearly the doctrines connected with the Cross, and flowing from it,—such as salvation obtainable solely through the one grand sacrifice once made by Christ and never to be repeated, justification by faith in the merits of Him who is the Lord our Righteousness, willing obedience to His lawful commands as the test of faith, and sanctification by the Holy Ghost as the sole means by which we become “meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light.” Although the Cross is occasionally used to denote our sufferings for Christ, it is chiefly employed, as St. Paul does in writing to the Galatians, to denote His sufferings for us. Hence the Apostle gloried in it to the exclusion of all other things, as it is this alone which mortifies our corruptions, and crucifies the world within our hearts. Hence his esteem of the Cross was great, and its influence upon his conduct in proportion. By it the world was crucified to him, and he to the world. Here was a mutual crucifixion. His esteem for Christ was the reason why the world despised “the bald-pated Galilean,” as he was termed in mockery, and was despised by him. Not that the Cross of Christ, with its life-giving power to all who spiritually understood its teaching, made him hate the men of the world, or refuse its lawful enjoyments; it permitted the use of the latter, and compelled the love of the former. But the reason why the Apostle dwells so forcibly on this crucifixion of the world is,—as St. John preached, “Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world: for all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world,”—because the inordinate love of worldly things is one of the chief sources of sin, and draws the mind away from Him whose service is perfect freedom. The Cross of Christ gave such a happy turn to the Apostle’s affections, that the world was no longer the same thing to him which it was to others, and had once been to himself when under the dominion of the Jewish law.

Thus the doctrine of the Cross, as understood by the Primitive Christians under the teaching of the great Apostle to the Gentiles, is in reality the doctrine of our redemption by the death and merits of God's only begotten Son; which has ever been regarded as the marrow and essence of the Gospel, and the cardinal doctrine of our holy religion. Great, unspeakably great as was the work of creation, greater far was the work of redemption. The creation was the work of God's fingers, so to speak; redemption was the work of His arm. In creation, God gave us ourselves; in redemption, He gave us Himself. The most glorious truth known on earth, which constitutes the glory of heaven now, and will constitute it through all eternity as the fundamental verity of the Christian religion, is the doctrine of our redemption by the sacrifice of God's only begotten Son. For this precious truth embraces all that man can want, and, with due reverence be it said, all that God could give; for God has but one only Son, and Him He spared not, but delivered Him up for us, in order that, consistent with His justice as well as with His mercy, He might "freely give us all things."

The doctrine of the Cross as taught by St. Paul, or, in other words, the doctrine of our redemption by the blood of Him who was "delivered for our offences and raised again for our justification," is the most precious truth ever revealed to poor sinful man. The blood-stained Cross of Christ, as seen by the eye of faith, is an object of such incomparable brightness, that it has shed a halo of glory around it to all the ends of the earth, to all the generations of men, and to all the ages of eternity. The greatest events that ever happened in this world of sin and sorrow fill with their splendour only a moment of time, and overspread with their glory but a point of space. Whereas the glory of redemption fills immensity, and shines throughout eternity; for this event adorns the records of time, enlivens the history of the universe, bringing honour to the Creator and salvation to the creature, and forms the endless song of that blessed company above who are represented in the Apocalypse as singing a new song, saying, "Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for Thou wast

slain, and hast redeemed us to God by Thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation ; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests : and we shall reign on the earth.”²

Such was the doctrine of the Cross as received and taught by the Primitive Christians ; and inasmuch as the true doctrine of the Cross became gradually corrupted little by little by their unworthy successors, the material figure of the cross became more and more idolized ; until the language of Scripture, which connects a curse with it, was utterly rejected and contradicted, until the accursed tree came to be worshipped by members of the Church of Rome *with the same species of worship which is due to God alone*.³ And so fatal is the confusion in the minds of many amongst ourselves, whose hearts appear to be set Rome-wards, that the language of St. Paul as glorying in the Cross, to which we have already called attention, is ignorantly quoted in defence of the worship of the image.

(1.) How different was the Primitive Christians, in respect to the material image of the cross, from that of many professing Churchmen in the present day, may be gathered from the reply which Tertullian makes to the false charges which the heathen were in the habit of bringing against the Christians of his time (the close of the second century) on this very point. Thus he speaks :—

“I come now to another calumny *which blackens us Christians with the adoration of the cross* ; and here I shall be enabled to prove the calumniator himself to be a fellow-worshipper, or sharer in the scandal ; for he that worships any piece of timber is guilty of the very thing falsely charged against us ; for what signifies the difference of dress and figure, while the matter and substance is the same ? *They are two wooden gods at best.*”⁴

² Rev. v. 9, 10.

³ This would be incredible were it not for the words of the *Roman Pontifical*, “Restored and edited by order of Clement VIII. and Urban VIII., Supreme Pontiffs,” wherein it is said that “the cross of the Pope’s ambassador takes precedence of the emperor’s sword, *because the worship of Latria (i.e., the worship due to God alone) is due to the cross of the apostolic legate.*” !!!

⁴ Tertullian, *Apology*, ch. xvi.

(2.) In the same strain Minutius Felix speaks of his fellow-Christians in the following century, respecting the false accusations against them of paying honour to a senseless piece of wood:—

“As for *the adoration of the cross*, which you object against us Christians, I must tell you frankly that we neither adore crosses nor desire them You certainly, who worship wooden gods, are the most likely people to adore wooden crosses.”⁵

From these testimonies we learn that to glory in the faith of the Crucified One, and to worship Him in spirit and in truth, is true Christianity such as the Primitive Church faithfully held and taught: but to glory in the material image and to worship it, as the Church of Rome pretends to do, is senseless idolatry in the estimation of every sound member of the Church of England, as our Homily declares: “These two words, idol and image, differ only in sound and language, but in meaning be indeed all one, specially in the Scriptures and matters of religion.” Those who consider the material cross as a “religious emblem,” forget that religious emblems may not be made except by God’s immediate authority. Those who abuse it, as so many do in the present day, appear to fall under the condemnation uttered by one of Israel’s faithful prophets, inspired to declare the will of God respecting this very sin:—

“Woe unto him that saith to the wood, Awake; to the dumb stone, Arise, it shall teach! Behold, it is laid over with gold and silver, and there is no breath at all in the midst of it. But the Lord is in His holy temple: let all the earth keep silence before Him.”⁶

When we see churches in the present day filled with crosses, often “laid over with gold and silver,” and not unfrequently with precious jewels besides, we may conclude that there is a wide departure from the doctrine and practice of the Primitive Christians respecting “the preaching of the Cross,” which we know from the Apostle’s solemn warning, “is to them that

⁵ Minutius Felix, *Octav. de Idol. Var.*, § 29.

⁶ Hab. ii, 20.

perish foolishness; but unto us which are saved it is the power of God.”⁷ Hence St. Paul’s solemn command to Timothy: “I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at His appearing and His kingdom; *Preach the word.* Be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering and *doctrine.*”⁸

And what a different message it is which the minister of Christ, as the ambassador of God, has to deliver to the two classes which constitute the outward Church—to the believer, a word of unspeakable comfort; to the nominal Christian and worldly-minded, a word of most solemn warning. For though there is in all men a natural conscience which distinguishes between good and evil, there is nothing in the unconverted soul which corresponds with the Apostle’s principle of “delighting in the law of God after the inward man.” Here the charmer may charm “never so wisely,” but in vain; the minstrel may exert his utmost skill, and pour forth strains sweet as the melodies of heaven, but there is no chord which vibrates to his touch when he appeals to sinners dead in trespasses and sins,—when he appeals to those who are “dead in trespasses and sins,” in praise of the beauty of holiness, and the loveliness of spiritual and Evangelical religion. In the book of the prophet Isaiah, God thus characterises His believing and faithful people:—“Hearken unto me, ye that know righteousness, the people in whose hearts is my law.”

⁷ 1 Cor. i. 18.

⁸ 2 Tim. iv. 1, 2.

CHAPTER V.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

IN treating on this important subject, and bearing in mind many of the practices which have lately crept into our Church, and are now strongly defended by a powerful party within our Zion, it may be well at the outset to state that our endeavour will be to show, by God's blessing, and with an earnest prayer for the Spirit's teaching that nothing but truth be set forth, that *the Primitive Christians partook of the Lord's Supper in the evening, after feasting; that the elements used were bread and wine alone, and were invariably partaken of by all present; that no adoration of the elements was ever thought of; that there was no such a thing known as a pretended sacrifice, nor what is termed "a real objective presence;" nor lights, unless required for giving light to the congregation; nor incense; nor the Eastward Position on the part of the officiating minister; nor was any distinctive dress worn by him on the occasion; and that the chief doctrine which they held in connection with this sacred rite was to show their faith in the efficacy of the first Advent of the Saviour, as well as their confident assurance in the reality of the second Advent, in accordance with the teaching of St. Paul in his Epistle to the Corinthians, "As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till He come."*⁹ This was the mode by which the Primitive Christians were wont to realize the presence of their absent Lord.

As regards *the hour* when the Primitive Christians were wont to partake of the Lord's Supper, it appears from the little which is said on the subject in Scripture that those of the

⁹ 1 Cor. x. 26.

earliest times, *i.e.*, who lived during the first century in apostolic days, partook of the Lord's Supper, in accordance with their Master's example, *after* the evening meal and *at night*. For not only do the writers of the synoptic gospels unanimously declare that it was "in the evening after supper" that our Lord instituted the rite, but St. Paul emphatically confirms the same by thus addressing the Corinthians:—

"For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus *the night* in which He was betrayed took bread; and when He had given thanks, He brake it and said, Take, eat: this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also He took the cup, when He had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as often as ye drink it, in remembrance of me."¹

There is only one instance mentioned in the New Testament to show how literally the Primitive Christians followed our Lord's example, and obeyed the apostolic precept. In the account recorded in the Acts of St. Paul's visit to Troas, it is said:—

"Upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together *to break bread*, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow; and continued his speech until midnight."²

As the "first day of the week" with the Jews commenced about six p.m. of what we call Saturday evening, and St. Paul's sermon continued until midnight, it is clear that the Christians at Troas on that occasion met to "break bread," *i.e.*, to partake of the Lord's Supper, *in the evening*, and consequently knew nothing of what the Church of Rome and her imitators fondly call "*morning mass*." And as St. Paul exhorted the Christians at Corinth, "Be ye followers (or imitators) of me, as I am of Christ," we see at once that those who adopt the practice of evening Communion have the order of their Master, the example of the Apostles, and the custom of the Primitive Church as their authority for so doing.

But have we any evidence for asserting that the Christians

¹ 1 Cor. xi. 23—25.

² Acts xx. 7.

of the second century adopted the same rule as their predecessors, to whom belongs more particularly the name of "Primitive?" Let the following testimony decide.

(1.) Pliny, the heathen Governor of Bithynia, A.D. 103, on the occasion of some Christians having been brought before him, wrote to the Emperor Trojan to tell him that—

"They were wont to meet together on a stated day before it was light, and sing among themselves a hymn to Christ, as God, and bind themselves by an oath against the commission of any wickedness, (*seque sacramento non in scelus aliquot obstringere.*) When these things were done it was their custom to separate, *and then come together again to a meal.*"³

As Pliny's mention of a "meal" can mean nothing else than *the Lord's Supper*, it is evident that the Christians of Pliny's time residing at Bithynia, like their predecessors at Troas half-a-century before, were in the habit of partaking of the Holy Communion at their second time of assembling on the Lord's-day, *i.e.*, in the evening, and not as a "morning mass."

(2.) Justin Martyr, who flourished about half-a-century later, has left a very full account of the Sunday worship of the Christians in his day, specially noticing the Lord's Supper; but as he does not mention the hour, his evidence on this point is of no value. But from the way in which he speaks of the assemblies of the brethren, we may infer that the custom then was, as it has been in the Church of England since the Reformation, to receive it *after* midday, or afternoon, when the hour of "evensong" is said to begin.

(3.) Tertullian, who wrote at the very close of the second century, gives us some intimation of the change which appears

³ It betrays a want of scholarship to argue, as some have done, that Pliny, by using the word *sacramentum*, means to assert that what we now call "the Sacrament," but which to the Primitive Christians was an unknown term subsequently adopted from the heathen, was administered in the morning assembly, forgetting that the "*sacramentum*" of a heathen writer of that period had a very different meaning from what it afterwards assumed in the Church of Christ. I doubt if the term "Sacrament of the Eucharist" was in use amongst Christians before the end of the second century. We meet with it in Tertullian's *De Coronâ*, § 3.

to have taken place in his time, when the Church departed from the example of Christ and the practice of the Primitive Christians. He says,—

“Our supper, which you accuse of luxury, shows its object in its very name. For it is called *Agapè*, which among the Greeks signifies ‘Love.’ . . . We regale ourselves in such a manner, as to remind us that we are to worship *God by night*. We preach in the presence of God, knowing that He hears us. Then after having washed our hands, and lights being brought in, every one joins in a hymn to God. Prayer again concludes our feast.”⁴

Whether Tertullian means the *Agapè* as distinct from the Lord’s Supper, is not quite clear, but it is universally admitted that the *Agapè*, which was introduced in the Church during the second century, *always preceded the Lord’s Supper*, until suppressed altogether in consequence of abuses; which shows that on such occasions the Lord’s Supper must of a certainty have been partaken of at night. Moreover, the same author, in another of his works, says,—

“The Sacrament of the Eucharist ordered by our Lord *to be taken at supper time*, and by all, we have *also* partaken of in the assemblies held before daylight.”⁵

Thus we gather from Tertullian’s words that it must have been towards the close of the second century when Christians began to depart from the customs of the Primitive Church, by partaking of the Lord’s Supper, first in the morning as well as the evening, and then subsequently in the morning alone, though there is evidence that for several centuries certain Churches were accustomed to partake of the Lord’s Supper on particular occasions in the evening.⁶

⁴ Tertullian, *Apol.*, § 39.

⁵ Tertullian, *De Coronâ*, c. iii. As some have misinterpreted the meaning of the sentence in the text, I give Tertullian’s words as follows:—“*Eucharistæ Sacramentum, et in tempore vietus et omnibus mandatum a Domino, ETIAM antelucanis cætibus.*”

⁶ Socrates tells us that “the Egyptian Christians in the neighbourhood of Alexandria, and those of the Thebais, hold their religious meetings on the Sabbath, (*i.e.*, the Jewish, or seventh day of the week,) and do not par-

It is melancholy to think, with such clear evidence as to the custom of the Primitive Christians in respect to evening Communion, that clergymen of our own Church can be found to cast reproaches on those who follow the example of Christ and the practice of the Apostles, in preference to that of the Church of Rome. Yet, to mention only one or two instances, we find Mr. Stanton, one of Mr. Mackonochie's curates, writing from St. Alban's Clergy-house, on the "Feast of the Circumcision," 1866, to say, "In our eyes evening Communion is *deadly sin*. For we believe it to be contrary to the mind of the Catholic Church, which is the mind of the Holy Ghost, and any act deliberately done contrary to the mind of the Church is *deadly sin*." And so Mr. Bennett, when examined by the Ritual Commission, in answer to a question by Earl Beauchamp respecting "Holy Communion in the evening," says, "I should consider it *sacrilege to celebrate in the evening*."⁷

It is difficult to think how any professing Christian minister could allow himself to assert that it was "sacrilege" to follow the example of our heavenly Master. Surely, in this instance, party-passion must have overstepped the bounds of reason. But Mr. Bennett, in his earlier and more enlightened days, once taught very differently, as may be seen in a sermon on the Lord's Supper, which he published in 1837, from which I make the following extract, as it puts in a succinct form the vast gulf which separates our Reformed and Protestant branch

take of the mysteries in the manner usual with Christians in general; for after having eaten of their ordinary evening meal, they make their oblations, and then partake of the Lord's Supper. (*Ecc. Hist.*, l. v. c. 2.) Towards the close of the fourth century, when morning Communion had become the common practice of most Churches, the Third Council of Carthage (A.D. 397) decreed that on Thursday in Passion week the Communion was to be administered in the evening after supper. St. Augustine (*Epist.* 118 *ad Januar.*) speaks of an evening Communion at that time with his fellow-believers, because it was "after the example of our Lord." And Ambrose, (*Sermo.* 8 *on Psalm* cxviii.,) writing in the same age, says distinctly that the Milanese Christians used to partake of the Lord's Supper "at the end of the day during a fast."

⁷ *First Report of the Ritual Commission*, Question 2663.

of Christ's Church in England from the fallen Church of Rome :—

“For the first three centuries the Lord's Supper was observed in its integrity, (*i.e.*, partaken of in the evening, after the example of Christ;) for the next three it was gradually overladen with cumbrous ceremonies; and for the succeeding nine centuries it was nearly lost in the corruptions and ignorance of a designing priesthood and a superstitious people. Our great Reformers have nearly restored the Sacrament to that plain and simple ceremony of memorial and spiritual sacrifice which our blessed Lord intended, rather than a pompous pageant outraging common sense. . . . Only consider our Church restored to the primitive and apostolic purity of its early days. There is exacted of the Christian community no irrational profession of belief; and there is required now no credit in the fables of Papal ignorance; there is demanded now *no worship of the host, no falling down before the material element of our own creating,*” &c.^s

Contrast Mr. Bennett's present teaching on the Lord's Supper—as set forth in his *Plea for Toleration*, in which he speaks of “the real, actual, and *visible* Presence of our Lord upon the altars of our churches;” and says, “Who myself *adore*, and teach the people to adore the consecrated elements, believing Christ to be in them; believing that under their veil is the sacred Body and Blood of my Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ,” (pp. 2 and 14, Editions 1 and 2,)—with that which he taught forty years ago, and then see how different are his present views from those of the Primitive Christians, and the height from which he has fallen. *Ubi lapsus, Quid feci!*

It is now nearly half-a-century ago that Mr. Bennett inducted me into Westminster School, and shortly before the publication of the sermon just quoted I resided with him as a private pupil previous to going to college. Although I have no recol-

^s The result of Mr. Bennett's present teaching may be seen in the fact that, according to the *R. C. Weekly Register* of November, 1874, out of thirty-one persons recently confirmed by the Popish Bishop of “Clifton” at Frome, eighteen had been once members of Mr. Bennett's congregation. We must not omit to mention that Mr. Bennett withdrew the word “visible” Presence from subsequent editions of his work, in order to avoid a legal condemnation, but then he took care to explain that he meant exactly the same thing.

lection of receiving any instruction whatever from him of a theological nature, I may have imbibed something of the primitive spirit manifested in that sermon; and I can truly and thankfully say that I have enjoyed deep spiritual pleasure in partaking of the Lord's Supper in our own church of an *evening*, as well as in receiving the Holy Communion together with Nonconformist brethren, where the order was to receive it *sitting and at midday*; and, what may surprise many, once when I had the opportunity of receiving it in a church of an advanced Ritualistic type at an early hour in the morning, and where, although I was naturally shocked by the officiating minister being arrayed in a vestment of gorgeous array, and by the consecrated element of bread being offered to me in the form of a *wafer*, I gladly acknowledge that the hymn in praise of our risen Saviour, (for it was on Easter morn,) sung by the congregation on their knees at the close of the service, though contrary to the order of our Church, was very beautiful, and conveyed solemn thoughts and deep spiritual joys to my soul. As regards "kneeling" or "sitting," it is a matter of simple indifference to the spiritually taught Christian. Our Church's order is to "kneel" at the reception of the bread and wine, which every loyal Churchman readily obeys; but the practice of the Primitive Christians appears to have been to partake of the Lord's Supper either sitting or reclining, as Christ and His Apostles at the institution of the rite. Marriott's *Vestiarum Christianum*, Plate xvi., contains a representation of the Lord's Supper, of a date possibly as early as the second or third century, copied from the cemetery of Marcellinus at Rome, in which the communicants are represented as *seated*.

One reason why certain amongst us are so much in the habit of declaiming against *evening Communion* appears to be that they think it more convenient to receive the Lord's Supper *fasting*, in place of after a feast. But such reasoning seems to be put forth either in ignorance of our Lord's example and the practice of the Primitive Church, or something worse; for if not caused by ignorance, it is simply equivalent to saying that *man's convenience is superior to God's law*.

It is scarcely necessary to point out that those who lay so much stress on what is termed "fasting Communion," contradict alike the letter and spirit of Scripture, as well as the practice of the early Christians. For not only is it most certain that it was originally instituted *after the Paschal feast*, and therefore could not have been partaken of "fasting," but the whole tenor of spiritual teaching as declared in the New Testament is intended to show, as St. Paul expressed it, that "the kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost."⁹ And as the Lord's Supper is essentially a time for feasting and rejoicing in place of fasting and mourning, we can only say to those who lay so much stress upon the necessity of partaking of it "fasting" after the manner of the Church of Rome, in the words of our Master, "When ye fast, be not, as the hypocrites, of a sad countenance: for they disfigure their faces, that they may appear unto men to fast. Verily I say unto you, They have their reward."¹

An anecdote is related of Robert Grossetete, the famous Bishop of Lincoln in the thirteenth century, who enjoined a friar, much troubled with melancholy, to drink as a penance a cup full of the best wine; and when it had been drunk very unwillingly by the faster, the good bishop said to him, "Dearest brother, if you frequently had such a penance you would have a much better regulated conscience."² And so a worthy successor of Grossetete in our own day, Bishop Wordsworth, has justly denounced the sin and folly of laying any stress on *fasting Communion*.

"Nothing," he said, "was more childish than to lay down as a rule that the ancient Church did so and so, and therefore we must do the same? Our blessed Lord reclined at Holy Communion. Were they to do the same? The Primitive Christians saluted each other with a holy kiss at the Communion. Was this to be practised also?" &c. &c.

⁹ Rom. xiv. 17.

¹ Matt. vi. 16.

² Luard's Preface to the Letters of Bishop Grossetete. The real scriptural mode of "fasting" in the way most pleasing to God Almighty is laid down very clearly by Isaiah, (lviii, 3—7,) and is thus understood and practised by

We have already seen that the Primitive Christians in their partaking of the Lord's Supper, whether in the evening or the morning, had before them two prominent doctrines of the newly-revealed religion, as St. Paul sets forth in his First Epistle to the Corinthians:—"As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till He come." We have before noticed how they regarded the doctrine of the Cross, or redemption by the death of the Saviour of mankind; and we may now profitably consider how they regarded the second of these doctrines alluded to by St. Paul, viz., the future coming of the same Saviour—no longer as the "Man of Sorrows," but as King of kings and Lord of lords, attended by His Bride, as said the prophet Zechariah:—"The Lord my God shall come, and all the saints with Thee."³ This was the doctrine very dear to the hearts of the Primitive Christians, and they gladly manifested their strong belief in the same by *weekly* partaking of the Lord's Supper, thus finding comfort in the hope of His speedy return. This was the argument which St. Paul used with such effect in his First Epistle to the Thessalonians, when treating of the believer's "blessed hope in the glorious appearing of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ," as he says, after directing their attention to the fact of the living as well as the dead saints being caught up "to meet their Lord in the air, and so shall be for ever with the Lord. *Wherefore* comfort one another with these words."⁴

Now it is an interesting question to see how the Primitive Christians understood this important doctrine concerning their Master's future advent, in which they testified their belief every time that they partook of the Lord's Supper.

(1.) Clement, the fellow-labourer of St. Paul, (Phil. iv. 3,) and who subsequently became chief pastor of the Christians residing at Rome, when "their faith was spoken of throughout

Protestants in England, in direct contrast to the nominal system of fasting, but in reality most luxurious feasting on fish and all other luxuries save "meat" food, authorized and adopted by the Church of Rome.

³ Zech. xiv. 5.

⁴ 1 Thess. iv. 17, 18.

the whole world," (Rom. i. 8,) in his Second Epistle addressed to the believers at Corinth, exhorts them on the subject of Christ's future advent in the following words:—

"Brethren, let us love one another, that we may attain to the kingdom of God. Let us *hour by hour* expect the kingdom of God in love and righteousness, because we know not the day of God's appearing." ⁵

(2.) Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis, in the first century, says of Christ's coming:—

"There will be a millennium after the out-resurrection from amongst the dead ones, when the personal reign of Christ will be established on the earth." ⁶

(3.) Justin Martyr (A.D. 166) has a very explicit testimony on this subject in his *Apology* on behalf of his persecuted brethren, as he says:—

"I and many others hold these opinions, and believe assuredly that thus it will come to pass, though I have intimated to you that some do not acknowledge it. But I and those Christians who are of orthodox judgment in all things, know that there will be a resurrection of the flesh and one thousand years in Jerusalem; and after this will be the universal resurrection and general judgment of all." ⁷

(4.) Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, A.D. 200, in relating what the prophets had foretold respecting Christ's kingdom, writes:—

"All these and other sayings of Isaiah are without controversy spoken of the resurrection of the just, which will take place after the coming of Antichrist and the destruction of all nations which are under him; at which time Christians will reign upon earth, growing by the sight of the Lord, and through Him shall be habituated to receive the glory of God the Father; and shall in the kingdom enjoy communion in spiritual things with the angels." ⁸

(6.) Tertullian, the contemporary of Irenæus, refers to this doctrine in several of his works, especially in his work against Marcion, wherein he refers to a work now lost, entitled, *On the Hope of the Faithful*, in which he had treated the subject more

⁵ Clem. Rom., 2 *Epistle to Cor.*, ch. xii.

⁶ Fragments of Papias, No. VI., from Eusebius' *Eccles. Hist.*, iii. 39.

⁷ Justin, *Dial. cum Trypho.*, cap. lxxxi.

⁸ Iren., *Adv. Hær.*, lib. v. cap. 85, § 1.

fully than in any other work. And thus he speaks of the way in which the Primitive Christians of his time received this doctrine :—

“ We confess our belief in a kingdom promised to us on earth and before heaven, but in a different state of being, viz., after the resurrection for one thousand years in Jerusalem, divinely built and brought down from heaven, which the Apostle calls *our mother from above*. This both Ezekiel knew and the Apostle John saw. . . . This Jerusalem, we say, is provided by God for receiving the saints upon the resurrection, and refreshing them with the abundance of all spiritual things.”⁹

Although during the two following centuries this doctrine was abused and perverted by some, owing to the immoderate carnality which had been creeping into the Church during that period, by which St. Augustine was subsequently led to doubt its truth, he nevertheless observes :—

“ That the opinion concerning it would at all events be unobjectionable, if it were believed that the saints should during that Sabbath have spiritual joys through the presence of the Lord, for we likewise thought so once.” Hence he says :—“ That eighth day spoken of in John xx. 26 signifies the new life at the end of the world. The seventh day signifies the peaceful rest of the saints which shall be upon the earth. *For the Lord will reign on the earth with His saints*, as the Scriptures teach, and will have a Church here below into which no evil shall enter.”¹

Such was the state of this doctrine as interpreted by the more orthodox among the Primitive Christians up to the close of the fourth century—held by most, though doubted by some, but by none during the first two and a half centuries of the Christian era whose name has been preserved to us. The first who openly impugned the doctrine, as far as is known, was Origen, who carried his system of allegorizing almost everything to such an extent, that at length he denied the doctrine of *eternal punishment*. The next person of note who questioned it was his pupil Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria, who denied the godhead of the Holy Ghost. The third was Jerome, who rejected that fundamental doctrine of experimental religion, viz.,

⁹ Tertul., *Adv. Marc.*, lib. iii. c. 24.

¹ August., Sermon *On the Lord's Day*.

“Justification by Faith;” and who appears to have been sunk in that slough of superstition, which subsequently became so fully developed in the fallen Church of Rome; yet Jerome candidly acknowledges that the mass of the faithful (*plurima multitudo*) in his time, *i.e.*, the same age as Augustine’s, were believers in the personal reign of Christ with His saints on earth, and that those who denied it went “contrary to the opinion of the ancients, such as Tertullian, Victorinus, and Lactantius, amongst the Latins; and of the Greeks, to pass over others, I will confine myself to the mention of one eminent person *alone*, viz., the illustrious and holy Irenæus of Lyons.”

Seeing, then, how clearly the doctrine of the Second Advent was held by those who lived nearest the time of the Apostles, it may be well to remember the practical importance of a right reception of this most blessed truth. Whosoever is longing for that “rest (or keeping of the Sabbatic millennium) which remaineth unto the people of God,” should, according to all Christian principle, be living *to* God, walking *with* God, and working *for* God.

And it is not uninteresting for us to know what our Saxon ancestors thought on this subject just one thousand years ago. I find one of the old monkish chroniclers of the time, in his record of the year A.D. 871, says:—

“The same year, after Easter, on the 9th of the calends of May, (April 23,) King Ethered (elder brother of ‘Alfred the Great’) went the way of all flesh, having governed the kingdom bravely, honourably, and in good repute for five years, through much tribulation: he was buried at Wimborne, *where he awaits the coming of the Lord and the first resurrection of the just.*”²

² *The Chronicle of Florence of Worcester*, p. 64. Though this author lived as late as the time of Edward I., I have supposed that he faithfully represents the teaching of the Anglo-Saxon Church in the ninth century.

CHAPTER VI.

THE CHRISTIAN ALTAR.

AT the Brighton Church Congress of 1874 there was some contention as to the proper meaning to be attached to the words of Hebrews xiii. 10, "We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle." On the one side it was contended, that in this passage we have Scripture authority for applying the term "altar" to the table on which the elements of bread and wine are placed at the Lord's Supper; on the other, that it has nothing whatever to do with the material table, but can only be referred to Him who laid down His life as a sacrifice for the sin of the world.

That the latter view, in which the altar is figuratively put for the sacrifice on the altar, which to the Christian is Christ Himself, who is alike our Altar, our Sacrifice, and our High Priest,³ is the more correct interpretation of the Apostle's meaning may be judged for this reason. That the "altar" in its literal signification refers to the sacrifice offered upon the altar is evident, because of this altar they were commanded to eat. And thus, those who eat of the Jewish sacrifices are termed by St. Paul, "partakers of the altar," (1 Cor. x. 18,) *i.e.*, of the things offered at the altar; and thus metaphorically it imports the body of our Lord offered up as a sacrifice once for all on the cross of Calvary; by partaking of the memorials of whose body, in the bread and wine at the Lord's Supper, according to our Master's command, we testify our communion with Christ and

³ Bishop Ridley has well expressed the opinion of our Reformers on this point, when he says,—“There was but one only sacrifice, and that once offered, namely, upon *the altar of the cross*,” (*Disputation at Oxford*, Park Soc. Edit., p. 207.)

His Church, as it is expressed :—"The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For we being many are one bread, and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread,"⁴—and of this "altar" they had no right to partake who still adhered to the Mosaic obligations. Hence we see that the word "altar" in Hebrews xiii. 10, cannot refer to any material altar or table, but to things to be eaten or partaken of which are placed on it; in other words, not the offering of a sacrifice, (*oblatio sacrificii*,) but as Tertullian very exactly terms it, *participatio sacrificii*, "the partaking of that which has been sacrificed,"—not the offering of something up to God upon an altar, but the eating of something which comes from God's altar, and is placed upon our tables. Dr. Cudworth, the learned author of *The Intellectual System*, in a valuable sermon on the true nature of the Lord's Supper, observes on this point :—

"Neither was it ever known among the Jews or heathen, that those tables, upon which they did eat their sacrifices, should be called by the name of altars. St. Paul, speaking of the feasts upon the idol sacrifices, calls the place on which they were eaten '*the table of devils*,' because the devil's meat was eaten upon them, not '*the altars of devils*;' and yet doubtless he spoke according to the true propriety of speech, and in those technical words that were then in use among them. Therefore, keeping the same analogy, we must needs call the Communion-table by the name of the Lord's table, *i.e.*, the table upon which God's meat is eaten; not His altar upon which it is offered. It is true, an altar is nothing but a table; but it is a table upon which God Himself eats, consuming the sacrifice by His holy fire. But when the same meat is given from God unto us, the relation being changed, the place on which we eat is nothing but a table." (P. 28.)

To be partakers of this Christian altar is to eat of the memorials of Christ's broken body and His shed blood in the bread and wine, according to His command; and it is by faith alone that true Christians, who form that "royal priesthood" spoken of by the Apostle Peter, are enabled to be partakers of those spiritual privileges which the Lord's Supper was designed to convey. As the Church of England truly teaches :—

⁴ 1 Cor. x. 16, 17.

"In such only as worthily receive the Supper of the Lord, they have a wholesome effect or operation ; but they that receive it unworthily purchase to themselves damnation, as St. Paul saith. . . The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner, and the means whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is *Faith*." ⁵

We now pass on to consider how the Primitive Christians understood the doctrine of what may be termed generally, "The Christian Altar." It is not a little remarkable that in the whole range of writings belonging to the fathers of the first three centuries of the Christian era, *i.e.*, the voice of the Ante-Nicene Church, which contain upwards of 26,243⁶ texts of Scripture either quoted or referred to, *there is not one single allusion of any kind to Hebrews xiii. 10*,—"We have an altar," which could scarcely have been overlooked by them all, if the Primitive Christians had interpreted those words in the same sense which some amongst us in the present day seek to impose upon them.

In order, however, that we may see in what sense the Ante-Nicene Church understood the term "altar," I propose to give some extracts from the writings of the fathers in chronological order, as a guide to us in our investigation :—

(1.) Thus Ignatius is represented as writing to the Ephesians as follows :—

"If any one be not within *the altar*, he is deprived of the bread of God. For if the prayer of one or two possesses such power that Christ stands in the midst of them, how much more that of the bishop and the whole Church." (Ch. v.)

And in the Epistle to the Magnesians he is supposed to write :—

⁵ Articles 25 and 28. Hence in the celebrated "Stone Altar case," it was decided by the Dean of Arches, as representing the voice of the Church of England, by his judgment delivered Jan. 31st, 1845, "*that a stone altar could not be legally erected in any church belonging to the Establishment.*"

⁶ In the *Index* to Tertullian's works, in which there are upwards of 8,000 texts referred to, the reader will find Heb. xiii. 10, entered once ; but upon turning to the passage, there is no reference to that passage of Scripture by Tertullian himself, but only a supposed allusion by the editor of his works.

“Do ye all, as one man, hasten to the house of God, as unto *one altar*, even Jesus Christ, the High Priest of the unbegotten God.” (Ch. vii.)⁷

(2.) Clemens Alexandrinus, who flourished in the second century, says:—

“Our earthly *altar* is the assembly of such as join in prayer, having as it were a common voice and mind.”⁸

(3.) Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, towards the close of the second century, writes:—

“It is the will of God that we should offer a gift at the altar frequently and without intermission. *The altar, then, is in heaven*; for towards that place our prayers and oblations are directed; and the temple is there likewise, as John says in the Apocalypse, ‘And the temple of God was opened.’”⁹

(4.) In a similar strain his contemporary Tertullian speaks:

“*The altar bright with gold*
Denotes the heaven on high, whither ascend
Prayers holy, sent up without crime: the Lord
This altar spake of,” &c.¹

(5.) Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, the devoted disciple of Tertullian, appears to use “altar” and “table” as signifying the same thing, in his Epistle addressed to Cæcilius “On the Sacrament of the Cup of the Lord;” and in his work written against the Jews, he quotes Prov. ix. 2,—“Wisdom hath made ready her table,” as typifying the Christian altar.²

(6.) Minutius Felix, in his work supposed to have been written A.D. 266, in reply to the question put to him by his opponent, “Why have the Christians *no altars*, no temples, and no images?” admits that they had none such, but asks in

⁷ As neither the portion quoted in the text from Ignatius’ Epistle to the Ephesians, nor the Epistle to the Magnesians, occur in the Syriac version of the Ignatian Epistles, it is doubtful whether they are of an earlier date than the third century. But of whatever date they may be, it is clear that the writer uses the term “altar” only in its spiritual signification.

⁸ Clem. Alex., *Stromata*, lib. vii. 6.

⁹ Irenæus *Adv. Hæres.*, lib. iv. cap. xviii. § 6.

¹ Tertullian, or the Author of *Five Books in Reply to Marcion*, lib. iv. 239—241.

² Cyprian’s *Epistles*, lxii., and *Treatise against the Jews*, § 2.

return, "Do you think that we conceal what we worship, if we have no temples or altars?"³

(7.) Origen, who flourished in the third century, says in reply to Celsus:—

"Christians, in remembrance of the Commandments, 'Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image,'—'Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve,' and many other similar commands, cannot permit, when worshipping the Divine Being, *either altars* or images, but are ready to suffer death, if necessary, rather than debase by any act of wickedness the doctrines which they hold concerning the Most High God."⁴

In another part of the same work Origen says:—

"We regard the spirit of every good man as an *altar*, from which arises an incense, which is truly and spiritually sweet smelling, viz., the prayers ascending from a pure conscience. . . . All Christians strive to raise such *altars* as we have described them, and these not of a lifeless and senseless kind, but filled with the Spirit of God, who dwells in the soul of him who is conformed to the image of his Maker. . . . We do not object to the erection of temples suited to the *altars* of which we have spoken; for we are taught that our bodies are the temple of God, and that if any one by sin defiles the temple of God he will himself be destroyed. Of all the temples mentioned in this sense, the best and most excellent was the pure and holy body of our Lord Jesus Christ."⁵

(8.) Arnobius, in his work, *Against the Gentiles*, written at the beginning of the fourth century, admits the truth of the accusations commonly charged against the Christians, "because we do not rear temples for the ceremonies of worship, nor set up any graven image, and do not erect *altars*."⁶

(9.) Lactantius, the tutor of the Emperor Constantine, writing about the same time, distinctly points to the well-known fact,

³ Minut. Felix, *Octavius*, cap. xxxii.

⁴ Origen, *Adv. Celsum*, lib. vii. cap. 64.

⁵ Ibid., Idem, lib. viii. cap. 17, 18, 19.

⁶ Arnobius, *Adv. Gentes*, lib. vi. § 1. The term employed is, *non altaria, non aras*, i.e., neither to the superior or inferior deities,—a reference to the practice of the heathen, who worshipped Jove as supreme, and also a number of deified men and women, in which they have been faithfully imitated by the Church of Rome.

as showing the vast gulf between the religion of the Gospel and the vain superstitions of the heathen, that the Christians had neither “temples, *altars*, nor images.”⁷

(10.) Methodius, Bishop of Tyre, martyred A.D. 312, after dwelling upon the spiritual nature of the law, and speaking of the typical nature of the tabernacle as a symbol of the Church, as the Church was of heaven, says:—

“It is fitting that the altars should signify some things in the Church. And we have already compared the brazen altar to the company of widows, for they are a *living altar of God*; but the golden altar within the Holy of holies, on which it is forbidden to offer sacrifice, has a reference to those who are pure virgins. This, then, I offer to thee, O Arete, on the spur of the moment, according to the best of my ability.”⁸

The earliest mention of the term “altar,” in the sense in which it is used by the Church of Rome, and her faithful imitators of our own communion, is to be found in the early liturgies of the Church, speaking generally; and the fact of the word “altar” being so employed is a proof that those parts could not have been introduced earlier than the fourth century, *i.e.*, after the Council of Nice, A.D. 325, when the union of the Church and State proved so detrimental to the spiritual life and doctrine of the Church of the living God. It is interesting to trace the growth of error in these several liturgies. Thus, in the earliest of them all, that which is called “The Divine Liturgy of James,” the germ of which, as we have already pointed out, may have been as early as the first century, we find “the priest” is described as “standing before Thy holy altar,” and saying “a prayer from the gates to the altar.” So in another liturgy, which bears the misnomer of “The Liturgy of the Blessed Apostles, composed by St. Adæus and St. Maris,” probably as late as the fourth or fifth century, the rubrical directions for the service of what the Primitive Christians called the Lord’s Supper, read as follows:—

“The priest draws near to celebrate, and *thrice bows before the altar*, the middle of which he kisses, then the right and left wings; and bows to the

⁷ Lactantius, *Divine Institutes*, lib. ii. cap. 2.

⁸ Methodius, *Banquet of the Ten Virgins*, ch. viii.

higher portion of it, and says, 'Pray for me, fathers, brethren, and masters, &c., that God may accept this oblation, for myself, for you, for the whole body of the holy Catholic Church,' &c. Presently the priest bows to the *lower portion of the altar*, and says, &c., &c. Then the priest rises up and uncovers the Sacraments, taking away the veil with which they were covered ; he blesses the incense, and says a canon with a loud voice," &c., &c.

Notwithstanding the late Rev. J. Mason Neale, who was deeply learned in liturgical lore, considers the Liturgy of Adæus and Maris⁹ "perhaps the very earliest of the many formularies of the Christian sacrifice," it is evident, as will be seen more fully as we pass onwards, that the Primitive Christians knew nothing whatever of "altars," or "bowing to" and "kissing" them, or of offering "incense" when partaking of what they knew to be the simple administrative rite of the Lord's Supper. Hence, when we find a decree attributed to Pope Fabian, Bishop of Rome, A.D. 236—251, to the following effect—

"We decree, that on each Lord's day *the oblation of the altar* should be made by all men and women in bread and wine, in order that *by means of these sacrifices they may be released from the burden of their sins,*"

we see instantly it could not have been composed by the Pope whose name it bears, and who flourished ages before the Church of Rome apostatized from the primitive faith ; and we are not surprised at learning that the sole authority for this manifest forgery is in the False Decretals collected by the monk Gratian, who lived as late as the twelfth century.¹

After the Council of Nice we find the fathers of the fourth and following centuries beginning to use the words "table,"

⁹ Neale's *General Introduction to a History of the Holy Eastern Church*, p. 323.

¹ The False Decretals, which contain the letters or edicts of the Bishops of Rome from a very early date, were known to be a forgery of the ninth century, of which a good account may be seen in Milman's *History of Latin Christianity*, vol. iii. p. 193, who says, "the author or authors of this most audacious and elaborate of pious frauds are unknown." The quotation in the text from a supposed decree of Pope Fabian is to be found in Gratian's Decretals, lib. v. cap. 7.

on which the Lord's Supper was administered, and "altar," as bearing the same meaning, and which was probably owing to the large accession of heathen, who professed Christianity after the union of Church and State, without knowing anything of either its power or spiritual teaching. And thus both the nomenclature and customs of the heathen became gradually interwoven with those of the Christian Church.

Augustine usually calls the Communion Table *mensa Domini*, which in his day was invariably made of wood; as when he describes a great outrage upon a bishop by some Donatists when he was "ministering to the Lord, for they beat him cruelly with clubs and other weapons, and at length with the *broken pieces of the wood of the altar*." ²

Gregory Nyssen, brother of the great Basil, who lived towards the close of the fourth century, appears to have been the first to mention a stone altar in a Christian church. He says, in his discourse on Christ's baptism,—

"This altar whereat we stand is by nature only *common stone*: but after it is consecrated and dedicated to the service of God it becomes a holy table, an *immaculate altar*."

About half-a-century later, (A.D. 440,) we find the ecclesiastical historian Socrates employing the terms "table" and "altar" as bearing *the same meaning*, when speaking of a person "going alone into the church, Irene, and approaching *the altar*, (*to thusiasterion*,) he throws himself on his face *beneath the holy table*, (*upo teen hieran trapezan*,) and prays with tears." ³

The next step, clearly in a heathen, and consequently anti-Christian direction, was taken in the following century, when a decree was made by a French Council at Epone, A.D. 509, that "no altars (*altaria*) should be consecrated, but such as were made of *stone only*." (Canon 26.)

² August., *Ep.* 50 *ad Bonifac.*

³ Socrat., *Eccles. Hist.*, lib. i. cap. 37.

After this change in the material of the "altars," the form or fashion of them changed likewise. For whereas before they were made in the form of tables, they now began to be erected *like the altars of the heathen*, either upon a single pedestal in the midst, or upon an edifice erected like a tomb, as was common in this country until the Reformation of the sixteenth century, when they were swept away, together with a multitude of other superstitious rites, which the Papal Church had so unhappily imbibed from its Pagan ancestry. But it is quite clear that the Primitive Christians knew nothing whatever of a material "altar" when commemorating the death of their Master at the Lord's Supper, save that spiritual one on which they gladly offered their hearts, devoted to the service of God.

I have heard of a Ritualistic priest catechizing his Sunday school children in the following form:—"What does St. Paul say we Christians have?"—"An altar." "And an altar is for——?"—"Sacrifice." "And the person who offers sacrifice is called——?"—"A Priest." "Then what are the three things which St. Paul says we have?"—"An altar, a sacrifice, and a priest"!!! Had this Ritualist been a little bit better acquainted with the Word of God, he might more faithfully have taught the lambs of his flock as follows:—"Where does St. Paul say the priests always go to perform the services?"—"Into the first tabernacle." "Is the first tabernacle standing now?"—"No." "Why not?"—"Because the way into the Holiest of all was not yet made manifest while the first tabernacle was standing." "Is the way into the Holiest of all made manifest to Christians?"—"Yes; we have, says the Apostle, 'boldness to enter in the Holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way.'" "Then, what has become of the first tabernacle?"—"It has no standing now." "And where are the priests to minister?"—"They have no place appointed on earth." "Then, if there be *no place appointed for a priest on earth*, there can be no——?"—"Altar." "And, if there is no altar, there can be no——?"—"Sacrifice." "Then what are the *three* things which St. Paul teaches Christians have not, and cannot have on earth?"—"NO ALTAR, NO SACRIFICE, and NO PRIEST."

It is lamentable to think how perfect is the resemblance between the Jewish priests in the days of Judah's apostasy, and that of the so-called Ritualistic "priests" in the present day. How applicable are the words of warning, which Jeremiah once uttered towards fallen Israel, to our Church at this time :

"The prophets prophesy falsely, and the priests bear rule by their means; and my people love to have it so: and what will ye do in the end thereof?" (Jer. v. 31.)

CHAPTER VII.

SACRIFICE.

THE doctrine of Sacrifice, whether in connexion with the Lord's Supper or not, was understood by the Primitive Christians in the sense which is so admirably expressed by our Reformed Church in her Communion Service, when she teaches the officiating minister to pray—"Here we offer and present unto Thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively *sacrifice* unto Thee." This is the only sense in which a well-taught "Catholic" can apply the term "sacrifice" in the economy of the Christian religion. Those who teach that in the Lord's Supper there is a *repetition* of the sacrifice, which Christ made once for all when He died on Calvary, on every occasion, assume that Sacrament and Sacrifice are convertible terms. Whereas, as our Church truly teaches, the Sacrament is a visible sign of something which God has given us to use—a memorial of Christ's sacrifice of Himself to atone for our sins, without which salvation would be impossible, as salvation comes only through *sacrifice*. We eat the broken bread and drink the wine in remembrance of Christ's sacrifice, as He hath commanded us to do; but to believe there is any repetition of that sacrifice at the Lord's Supper appears to be a most fatal and terrible mistake.

Yet many amongst ourselves in the present day seem to assert this doctrine in the most determined way. Thus a standard work of the Ritualistic school quotes with approval a sentence from Bishop Cosin, (though without any reference to enable an enquirer to verify the quotation,)—

"We call the Eucharist a propitiatory sacrifice, both this and the Sacrifice on Calvary, because both of them have force and virtue to appease God's wrath against this sinful world."⁴

⁴ *The Ritual Reason Why*, No. 284, p. 109.

Another work of apparent authority with the same school teaches,—

“In the celebration of the Holy Eucharist the four ends with which the sacrifice is offered to God are these:—I. As an act of adoration. II. As a sacrifice of thanksgiving. III. As a sin offering, to plead for our pardon. IV. As an act of supplication for mercies.”⁵

Canon Courtenay, Vicar of Bovey Tracey, asserts that,—

“Whenever the Holy Sacrifice is offered, Jesus is Himself present on the altar of His Church as God and man.”⁶

Dr. Pusey, as the most distinguished leader of this school, although he refrains, as far as I have been enabled to discover in his writings, from asserting “the Eucharistic Sacrifice,” as he terms it, in the same open way as in the passages already given, nevertheless asserts that,—

“In the Holy Eucharist we do in act what in our prayers we do in words. I am persuaded that, on this point, the two Churches (of England and Rome) might be reconciled by explanation of the terms used. The Council of Trent, in laying down the doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass, claims nothing for the Holy Eucharist but an *application* of the One meritorious Sacrifice of the Cross. An *application* of that sacrifice the Church of England believes also.”⁷

With a similar object in view, of attempting to show the unity between the Churches of England and Rome on the subject of “the Eucharistic Sacrifice,” Mr. Bennett asks, with apparent doubt and regret,—

“Is it really the case that the Church of Rome is the only Communion in which men may hold the doctrines of the Real Presence and the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and be in proportion reverential in their devotions, and adore God in that blessed offering?”⁸

⁵ *The Altar Manual*. Edited by a Committee of Clergy. P. 9.

⁶ *The Presence of Jesus on the Altar*. Preface. C. L. C. Bovey Tracey, May, 1872.

⁷ *An Eirenicon*, by E. B. Pusey, D.D., p. 28.

⁸ *Plea for Toleration in the Church of England*, by the Rev. W. J. E. Bennett, p. 15. So in his examination before the Ritual Commission, when asked, “What is the doctrine involved in your using the Chasuble?” he replied, “*The doctrine of the Sacrifice.*” “Do you consider yourself a

As Dr. Pusey has elsewhere asserted that "the Council of Trent, whatever its look may be, and our Articles, whatever their look may be, each could be so explained as to be reconciled one with the other,"⁹ it will be right for us to consider what it is that the Church of Rome, especially by its authoritative Council of Trent, teaches on the subject of "the Eucharistic Sacrifice." These are her words:—

"If any one shall say that *a true and proper sacrifice* is not offered to God in the mass, let him be accursed. . . . If any shall say that the mass is only a service of praise and thanksgiving, or a mere commemoration of the sacrifice made upon the cross, and not a propitiatory offering, or that it only benefits him who receives it, and ought not to be offered for the living and the dead, for sins, punishments, satisfactions, and other necessities, let him be accursed. . . . In the divine sacrifice which is performed in the mass, the same Christ is contained and bloodlessly immolated, who once offered Himself bloodily upon the cross. . . . There is one and the same victim, and the same person who now offers by the ministry of the priests, who then offered Himself on the cross, the mode of offering only being different."¹

Such is the authoritative teaching of the Church of Rome on the subject of "the Eucharistic Sacrifice;" and inasmuch as Dr. Pusey considers there is no great difference between that Church and our own, he explains the apparent discrepancy between the language of our Articles, which teach that—

"The offering of Christ once made is the perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone: wherefore *the*

sacrificing priest?"—"Distinctly so." "Then you think you offer a propitiatory sacrifice?"—"Yes, I think I do offer a propitiatory sacrifice." (*Evidence of the Rev. W. J. E. Bennett before the Ritual Commission*, p. 72.)

⁹ English Church Union *Circular*, July, 1866, p. 197. In the same way the *Church News*, of July 7, 1869, affirmed that "the English Church was really one with the Church of Rome in *faith, orders, and Sacraments*." And the *Church Times*, of June 18th, in the same year, declared that "the differences between the authoritative documents of Rome and England are infinitesimal, the priesthood the same, the Liturgy virtually the same, *and the doctrine the same*."

¹ Council of Trent, Sacrifice of the Mass, Sess. XXII. Canons 1 and 3; and Decree on the Sacrifice of the Mass, 5.

sacrifices of masses, in the which it was commonly said that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits,"²—

in the following manner. After speaking of the "sacramental or hyperphysical change," which "no English Churchman could hesitate to accept," he says:—

"The doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice depends upon the doctrine of the real objective Presence. The very strength of the expressions used of 'the sacrifices of masses,' that they were 'blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits,' the use of the plural, and the clause 'in the which it was commonly said,' show that what the Article speaks of is not 'the sacrifice of the mass,' but the habit (which, as one hears from time to time, still remains) of trusting to the purchase of masses when dying, to the neglect of a holy life, or repentance, and the grace of God and His mercy in Christ Jesus while in health."³

Shall we be doing injustice to Dr. Pusey if we paraphrase his reasoning in the following way:—*Mass* is right, but *masses* are wrong because they are the plural of *mass*, which is right. We do not exactly see the force of such reasoning; but it may be from a deficiency on our own part to detect it. It seems to us as if it belonged to that system of non-natural interpretation which is so congenial to some minds, but which hardly becomes the candour of a believing Christian. Dr. Pusey dissents, of course, from this, for he continues to defend his mode of argument, by reminding his readers that the celebrated Tract No. XC.—written by Dr. Newman before his secession to the Church of Rome, with the view to show that it was possible to hold all Roman doctrine and yet remain a minister of the Church of England—

"Has done good and lasting service, by breaking off a mass of unauthorized traditional glosses, which had encrusted over the Thirty-nine Articles. The interpretation which he then put forth, and which in him was blamed, was at the time vindicated by others without blame. No blame was attached either to my own vindication of the principles of Tract XC., or to that of the Rev. W. B. Heathcote. I vindicated it in my letter to Dr. Jelf, as the natural grammatical interpretation of the Articles; Mr. Heathcote, as their only admissible interpretation. . . . *It was misinterpreted in an extreme Roman*

² Article XXXI.

³ *Eirenicon*, p. 25.

sense by Mr. Ward. But the principle of Tract No. XC., viz., that we are not to bring into the Articles, out of any popular system, any meanings which are not contained in their words, rightly and accurately understood, was not and could not be condemned.”⁴

As regards the propriety of applying the term “sacrifice” to anything save the surrender of the believer’s heart to the service of God, Bishop Andrewes perhaps uses the term in the least objectionable way, which some amongst us of his school in the present day might profitably follow. He says:—

“This is it in the Eucharist that answereth to the sacrifice in the passover, —the memorial to the figure. To them it was, ‘Do this in *prefiguration* of me.’ To us it is, ‘Do this in *commemoration* of me.’ To them *foreshewing*, to us shewing forth. By the same rule that theirs was, by the same way ours is termed a *sacrifice*;—in rigour of speech, neither of them. For (to speak after the exact manner of divinity) there is but one only sacrifice, properly so-called, that is, Christ’s death; and that sacrifice but once actually performed, at his death; but ever before represented in figure from the beginning, and ever since repeated in memory to the world’s end.”⁵

More decidedly has the “judicious Hooker expressed his opinion on the point, when recommending the use of the word “Presbyter” in preference to that of “Priest,” as more agreeable “with the drift of the whole Gospel of Jesus Christ,” because, as he emphatically declares, “Seeing that *sacrifice is now no part of the Church ministry*, how should the name of *priesthood* be thereunto applied.” The impossibility of acknowledging that there is anything of the nature of a “sacrifice” in the Lord’s Supper accords with the teaching of Holy Scripture, as explained in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Thus it is written:—

“Our High Priest needeth not daily to offer up sacrifice, first for His own sins, and then for the people’s: for this He did *once for all*, when He offered up Himself. . . . Christ being come an High Priest of good things to come . . . by His own blood entered in *once for all*. And every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes *the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins*; but this man, after He had offered one *sacrifice for*

⁴ *Eirenicon*, pp. 30, 31.

⁵ Bishop Andrewes, *Seventh Sermon, On the Resurrection*.

ever, sat down on the right hand of God. For by one offering He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.”⁶

The word used in these passages, and thrice repeated, to signify the impossibility of any repetition of the *sacrifice* which Christ made at Calvary, is a compound word,⁷ evidently designed to prove that there is no longer, in the Gospel dispensation, any “sacrifice” which man can offer or God accept, in the way of atoning for sin, as saith the Holy Ghost, “There remaineth no more sacrifice for sins.”⁸ But those who contend that at every administration of the Lord’s Supper there is something besides a sacrifice of ourselves, or a sacrifice of praise, contend that the command of our blessed Lord, “Do this in remembrance of me,” means in reality “*Sacrifice this*,” &c.⁹ They argue that Christ employed “two distinctly sacrificial terms,” and refer to Numbers x. 10, and Leviticus xxiv. 7, in support of their opinion.¹ The word rendered “do” (*poieite*) does not occur in either of the above passages of the Septuagint Version; nor does it, as I believe, ever have the signification of “sacrifice.” Who ever read in a Greek author that *soma poiein* meant to “sacrifice a body?” St. Paul, in 1 Corinthians xi. 25, uses exactly the same phrase in reference to the *cup*—“Jesus took the cup, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.” Even

⁶ Heb. vii. 26, 7; ix. 11, 12; x. 10—14.

⁷ *Ephapax*, from *epi* “upon” or “at,” and *apax*, “once.”

⁸ Heb. x. 26.

⁹ “By the Eucharistic Sacrifice is not meant merely a ‘sacrifice of prayer and praise;’ nor does the Eucharistic Sacrifice merely mean the offering of ‘ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto God;’ still less does it mean the offering of bread and wine for use in the Sacrament, which, nevertheless, because they are thus offered, are called ‘oblations;’ but the *Eucharistic Sacrifice is Christ Himself, supernaturally present in the Sacrament*, the victim slain once for all upon the Cross, but continually offered before God in memory of that death, by His own natural presence in heaven, and by His supernatural presence in the Sacrament here on earth.” (*Some Thoughts on Low Masses*, by the Rev. E. Stuart, Vicar of St. Mary Magdalene, London, p. 31.)

¹ Letter in the *Guardian* of Aug. 5th, 1874, signed “H. L. Russell,”

Romanists do not venture to contend that the cup is *sacrificed*, but only that it was consecrated by these words; for the Lord's Supper, as we have already seen, was not a reiteration, but a commemoration of the sacrifice made by Christ once for all. Well, therefore, did Bishop Jewel ask :—

“What father or doctor ever taught that *hoc facite* (do this) was the same as *hoc sacrifice* (sacrifice this)? Christ did not by these words, ‘*Do this in remembrance of me,*’ erect a new succession of sacrificers, to offer Him up really unto His Father, nor ever did any ancient father so expound it.”²

Hence, when the late Dr. Vogan, whose valuable treatise on *The True Doctrine of the Eucharist* will become a standard work for the future,³ endeavoured to bring the matter to a practical issue by courteously inviting both Dr. Pusey and Archdeacon Denison to defend their interpretation of our Lord's words at the institution of the rite, they were compelled absolutely to *decline*. Dr. Vogan also invited them to express their own views in the following categorical propositions, leaving a space to be filled up as they thought fit :—

Our Lord then said :—

“This is my body which is given for you.”

Dr. Pusey and Archdeacon Denison :—

“This ——”

Our Lord said :—

“This is my blood which is shed for you.”

Dr. Pusey and Archdeacon Denison :—

“This ——”

Dr. Vogan shows that his opponents cannot express their doctrine in propositions, the subject, the copula, and the predicate of which are the exact equivalents of our Lord's words. He gives an illustration of this in the following tabular form :—

² Jewel's *Answer to Harding*, p. 715. Parker Soc. Edit.

³ We must not forget to mention with equal approval the excellent works on the same subject by the late Dean Goode, and by the Rev. John Harrison, D.D., Vicar of Fenwick.

(1.) This	is	my body which is given for you.
(2.) This	has under its form the real presence of	my glorified body.
(3.) This	is	my blood which is shed for you.
(4.) This	has under its form the real presence of	my glorified body. ⁴

Nos. 1 and 3 are *the words of our Lord*. Nos. 2 and 4 are *the statements* of those who hold what may be called the “*corporalist doctrine*.” And it surely betrays a conscious sense of weakness in their cause when such distinguished theological controversialists, as Archdeacon Denison and Dr. Pusey are known to be, are afraid or unwilling to accept so fair a challenge as that to which they have been invited. It has been said of the latter that he “has done more than any man in England to provoke controversy;” and the fact of his admitted inability to defend the views which he has so long held and so persistently advanced by every means in his power, reminds us of the way in which the celebrated challenge of Bishop Jewel, delivered at Paul’s Cross on the Sunday before Easter, A.D. 1560, has been met by the Roman Church during the last three centuries. *Prolonged silence is the virtual acknowledgment of defeat.*

Before considering what was the doctrine of the Primitive Christians on the subject of sacrifice, it may be well briefly to notice what our Reformed Church has authoritatively taught on the matter.

⁴ See Dr. Vogan’s *Letter to Archdeacon Denison and Dr. Pusey*, Longmans, 1874. This subject is admirably treated by Dr. Blakeney, in the *Christian Advocate* of Dec. 1874. Dr. Vogan’s chief work originated with some lectures delivered at Chichester Cathedral, in 1849, which were subsequently embodied in his volume on *The True Doctrine of the Eucharist*, which contains a critical examination of the whole history of the Eucharistic controversy, a summary of which may be expressed in Dr. Vogan’s own words as follows:—“When our Lord took bread and wine for His Holy Supper, instead of sacrificing them, and so devoting them to destruction, He blessed with thanksgiving, and He spoke of no oblation or sacrifice, but of Himself. The literal interpretation admits of no sacrifice to be offered by us in fulfilling His words that we should do as He did, but that which is comprehended in the *sacrifice of thanksgiving*. This is *the true Eucharistic sacrifice*.”

In the Twenty-eighth Article, where the Lord's Supper is strictly defined, and where it is positively affirmed that "the Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper, *only after an heavenly and spiritual manner*," there is no mention whatever of "sacrifice." In the Thirty-first Article, as we have already seen, "the sacrifices of Masses," one of the many grave abuses in the Roman Church, are properly described as "blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits." In the Twenty-seventh Homily of our Church the idea of a sacrifice in the Lord's Supper is indignantly repudiated; as we read therein:—

"Thou needest no other sacrifice than Christ's merits, because He hath made upon His cross a full and sufficient sacrifice for thee. . . . We must then take heed lest of a memory it be made a sacrifice."

In the Twenty-eighth Homily it is charged as a crime against the Papists that—

"Whereas Christ commanded to His Church a Sacrament of His body and blood, they have changed it into a sacrifice for the quick and dead."

In accordance with such faithful teaching on the subject of the Lord's Supper, our Reformers are unanimous in repudiating all idea of a sacrifice in connection with that sacred rite. Thus, to quote only one, with the assurance, *Ex uno disce omnes*, we find *Cranmer* speaking thus:—

"All such priests as pretend to be Christ's successors in making a sacrifice of Him, they be His most heinous and horrible adversaries. . . . Wherefore all Popish priests that presume to make every day a sacrifice of Christ, either must they needs make Christ's sacrifice vain, imperfect, and unsufficient, or else is their sacrifice in vain which is added to the sacrifice which is already of itself sufficient and perfect. . . . Therefore, when the old fathers called the mass or Supper of the Lord *a sacrifice*, they meant that it was a sacrifice of lauds and thanksgiving, and so as well the people as the priest do sacrifice, or else that it was a remembrance of the very true sacrifice propitiatory of Christ; but they meant in nowise that it is a very true sacrifice for sin, and applicable by the priest to the quick and dead."⁵

And to quote one more testimony of a century later than the age of the Reformation—that of *Bishop Cosin*, who is known to

⁵ *Cranmer, On the Lord's Supper*, pp. 348, 353. Parker Soc. Edit.

have had much to do with the last revision of our Prayer Book in 1661, and who is frequently quoted as expressing the opinions of the extreme High Church party in his own day; he says distinctly:—

“Christ can be no more offered, as the doctors and priests of the Roman party fancy Him to be, and vainly think that every time they say mass, they offer up and sacrifice Christ anew, as properly and truly as He offered up Himself in His sacrifice upon the cross. And this is one of the points of doctrine, and the chief one whereof the Popish mass consisteth, abrogated and reformed here by the Church of England, according to the express word of God.”⁶

To the above I would add the testimony of an eminent man of God, holy *Bishop Beveridge*, who flourished about half-a-century later than the time of Bishop Cosin. In his work *On the Articles*, when contending against any sacrifice in the Lord’s Supper, he writes:—

“As this doctrine is contrary to Scripture, so is it repugnant to reason too, there being so vast a difference betwixt a sacrament and a sacrifice: for in a sacrament God offereth something to man, but in a sacrifice man offereth something to God. What is offered in a sacrifice is wholly or in part destroyed, but what is offered in a sacrament still remaineth. And there being so great a difference betwixt one and the other, if it be a sacrament it is not a sacrifice, and if it be a sacrifice it is not a sacrament, it being impossible it should be both a sacrament and a sacrifice too.”⁷

Such being the authoritative teaching of the Reformed Church of England on the subject of sacrifice, and in accordance with that of the best and greatest of her divines, we pass back through the vista of ages to take a retrospective glance at what the Primitive Christians held and taught on this question, which is so much controverted amongst ourselves in the present day. The only “sacrifice” of which the Primitive Church knew anything is described in the following terms.

⁶ John Cosin, Bishop of Durham, Rl. Commr. of Savoy Conf., A.D. 1661. *Notes on the Book of Common Prayer*, 2nd Series, vol. v., p. 333, Oxford, 1855.

⁷ William Beveridge, Bishop of St. Asaph, *On Article XXXI*. Works, vol. vii., p. 506, Oxford, 1845.

(1.) In the *Epistle* attributed to Barnabas it is written :—

“God hath revealed to us by all the prophets that He requires neither *sacrifices*, nor oblations. . . . We ought, therefore, to perceive the gracious intention of our heavenly Father when He declares that *the sacrifice* pleasing to God is a broken spirit and a contrite heart.”⁸

(2.) In the *Clementine Homilies*, said to be the work of Clement of Rome, at the close of the first century, it is written :—

“God is not pleased with sacrifices; since He did not ordain sacrifices as desiring them; nor from the beginning did He require them. There can be no sacrifice without the slaughter of animal life.”⁹

(3.) Athenagoras gives the following reason why the Primitive Christians did not offer any sacrifices :—

“Most of those who charge us with Atheism, and that because they have not the most dreamy conception of what God really is, and are utterly unacquainted with spiritual things, are such as measure religion by a system of sacrifice. . . . And as to our not offering any sacrifice, it is because God needs it not; but the noblest sacrifice and the only one which He can accept is to know Him who made the heavens and the earth. This, indeed, it behoves us to offer as a bloodless sacrifice, which, as the Apostle says, is our ‘reasonable service.’”¹

(4.) Irenæus, in his celebrated work *Against Heresies*, gives a long account of the distinction between the sacrifice and the offerings which it was lawful and right for Christians to make unto God. The burden of his teaching seems to be expressed in the following words :—

“The oblation of the Church, therefore, which the Lord gave instructions to be offered throughout all the world, is accounted with God a pure *sacrifice* from us, but that *he who offers is himself* glorified in what he does offer, if his gift be accepted.”

Irenæus contends, in the same chapter, that—

“As the bread of the Eucharist is no longer common bread, but consists of two realities, earthly and heavenly, so also our bodies, when they receive

⁸ Epistle of Barnabas, ch. ii.

⁹ *Clementine Homilies*, ch. 45.

¹ Athenagoras' *Apology for the Christians*, ch. 13.

the Eucharist, are no longer corruptible, having the hope of the resurrection to eternity."

From this it is manifest that he is speaking of these things as our Church does in her Articles, "only after an heavenly and spiritual manner," which is confirmed by what he says in the paragraph following, and which has been already quoted in our chapter on the "Christian Altar," viz., that "*the altar to which our prayers and oblations are directed is in heaven.*"²

(5.) Clemens Alexandrinus, the contemporary of Irenæus, defines the Christian sacrifice in another way, by saying:—

"Our earthly altar is the assembly of such as join in prayer, having as it were a common voice and mind. For the *sacrifice of the Church is the word*, ascending as incense from holy souls; their sacrifice and their whole souls being open to God. . . . The wise man's entire life will be a holy festival; and his constant *sacrifice* will be prayers and praises, and reading Scripture before eating; psalms and hymns after eating; and prayers again at night."³

(6.) Tertullian has much in his various works on the subject of "sacrifice;" but then he shows distinctly that the only sacrifice permitted to the Christian is the sacrifice of the believer's heart in prayer and praise to God. This he shows in his *Answer to the Jews*, (ch. v.) In the *Apology*, (§ 27,) he points out that when Christians are "called on to sacrifice, we absolutely refuse," notwithstanding "some think it a piece of insanity, when it is in our power to offer sacrifice only once, and then go away unharmed." But in another work, *Ad Scapulam*, (§ 2,) he points out the Christians were wont to sacrifice in the only way permitted to them, saying:—

"We therefore sacrifice for the emperor's safety, but it is to our God and his, and that after the manner which our God has enjoined, viz., *by simple prayer*. For the Almighty Creator of the universe has no need of incense or of blood as connected with sacrifice. These things are only food fit for devils."

Hence Tertullien, in his work *On Prayer*, containing nearly

² Irenæus, *Adv. Hæres.*, lib. iv. cap. xviii. §§ 1, 5, 6.

³ Clem. Alex., *Stromata*, lib. vii. cap. 6 and 7.

thirty chapters, and where the subject is very fully considered, says :—

“Prayer is the spiritual victim, which has now abolished the ancient sacrifices as formerly commanded by God. . . . God is a Spirit, and accordingly requires His worshippers to worship Him in spirit and in truth. We Christians are the true worshippers and true priests, who praying in spirit, sacrifice in spirit, which is solely by prayer, the only victim acceptable unto God. This blessed victim devoted from the whole heart, fed on faith, tended by truth, entire in innocence, pure in chastity, garlanded with love, we ought to escort with the power of good works, amid psalms and hymns, unto God’s altar, (heaven,) in order that we may receive all things from Him who alone can hear and answer prayer.”⁴

(7.) Cyprian, the distinguished disciple of Tertullian, who is said to have daily read some of his master’s works, in one of his *Treatises* written against the Jews, to show how completely the ancient sacrifices, which God had once commanded, had been abolished by the Gospel, calls attention to the argument of Isaiah as to the uselessness of the multitude of sacrifices, which the Jewish Ritualists of his day had imposed upon the people, by showing that in the Christian dispensation the only sacrifices acceptable unto God were the sacrifices of prayer and praise and righteousness.⁵

(8.) Minutius Felix adopts the same strain, and shows, in answer to the accusation of the heathen that the Christians had no sacrifices, that “the victim fit for sacrifice which Christians were accustomed to offer was—

“A good disposition, a pure mind, and a sincere judgment. Therefore, he who cultivates innocence supplicates God; he who cultivates justice makes offerings to God; he who abstains from fraudulent practices propitiates God; he who snatches man from danger slaughters the most acceptable victim. These are our sacrifices, these are our rites of God’s worship.”⁶

(9.) Lactantius argues in the same way, saying :—

“There are two things to be offered to God, a free-will offering or gift and a sacrifice; the gift is for eternity, the sacrifice for time. With those

⁴ Tertullian, *On Prayer*, ch. 28.

⁵ Cyprian, *Testimonies Against the Jews*, § 16.

⁶ Min. Felix, *The Octavius*, ch. 32.

who do not understand spiritual things, a gift is anything wrought in gold or silver, or purple or silk ; and a sacrifice is a victim, or anything burnt upon an altar. But God, because He is incorruptible, does not make use either of one or the other. God can only accept that which is incorporeal. Therefore, the offering which He loves is innocency of soul ; and the sacrifice acceptable to Him is praise and hymns.”⁷ . . . “ This is true sacrifice, which is brought forth, not from the chest, but from the heart ; not that which is offered by the hand, but by the mind. This is the acceptable victim, which the mind sacrifices of itself.”⁸

(10.) Arnobius says, in reply to the false accusations of the heathen :—

“ You are in the habit of fastening upon us a very serious charge of impiety, because we do not build temples for a ceremonial worship, do not set up statues or images of any god, do not erect altars, do not offer the blood of any creature slain in sacrifice, do not use incense, and have no sacrificial meal. . . . It is perfectly true, we Christians do none of these things.”⁹

From these testimonies, collected from the writings of the most famous divines of the first three centuries, it is clear that the Primitive Christians knew nothing whatever of any other sacrifice than that of the heart offered in the way of prayer and praise to the service of the unseen God. And, therefore, when we find any in the present day calling the Lord’s Supper a “ holy *sacrifice*, when Jesus is Himself present on the altars of His Church as God and Man,”¹ we see not only how far removed such doctrines are from that of the Primitive and Catholic Church in its best and purest days, but also how closely they approximate to the false and idolatrous teaching of the Church of Rome. Indeed, one of that school, more outspoken than his friends in general, dogmatically asserts that “ *The Church of England holds precisely the same view of the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper as the Church of Rome.*”²

Although our opponents may quote some of the ancient

⁷ Lactantius, *The Divine Institutes*, lib. vi. c. 25.

⁸ *Epitome of the Divine Institutes*, ch. 58.

⁹ Arnobius, *Adv. Gentes*, lib. vi. §§ 1, 3.

¹ Canon Courtenay’s Preface to *The Presence of Jesus on the Altar*.

² *The Kiss of Peace*, by the Rev. Gerald Cobb, p. 108.

liturgies in proof that the terms “priest,” “altar,” “sacrifice,” “incense,” &c., were terms early employed to denote the various customs in the administration of the Lord’s Supper, it is only a proof that those liturgies, or rather those parts of the ancient liturgies employing such terms, must have been drawn up either in or later than the fourth century, when the union of Church and State, by the influence of the great Emperor Constantine, had been the cause of introducing heathen customs amongst Christians, and the tide of error and heresy had set in with such a strong flow that it eventually culminated in mediæval superstition and the apostate teaching of the Council of Trent. Nevertheless we find, in what is termed *The Divine Liturgy of St. James*, proofs that the sacrifice there spoken of was of the nature so consistently held by the Primitive Christians, as pertaining to prayer and praise. Thus the prayer numbered III. in that liturgy reads thus:—

“Sovereign Lord Jesus Christ, O Word of God, who didst freely offer Thyself *a blameless sacrifice* upon the cross to God, even the Father, the coal of double nature, that didst touch the lips of the prophet with the tongs, and didst take away sins, touch also the hearts of us sinners, and purify us from every stain, and present us holy beside Thy holy altar, that we may offer to Thee *a sacrifice of praise*.”

Of those Christians who flourished after the time of the Council of Nice, the two most eminent authorities are undoubtedly Chrysostom in the East, and St. Augustine in the West; and in order to show how uncertain the sound which their gospel trumpet gives, it may be shown of the former, that while in one place he speaks of “the sacrifices which the Church possesses as being without blood or altars, which sacrifices are alone pure and acceptable to God,”³ in other parts of his voluminous works it may be seen that he calls the Lord’s Supper “a most awful sacrifice, in which Christ is sacrificed,” and that then and there “the priest takes in his hand the *Lord of the universe*” !!!

So with regard to the latter, although St. Augustine is repre-

³ Chrysostom, *Homily in Psalm 96*.

sented by Dr. Pusey as the voice of the ancient Church teaching in the following way,—

“In the words of the ancient Church, he” (the penitent, in the language of Augustine) “‘drinks his ransom,’ he eateth that ‘the very Body and Blood of the Lord, the only sacrifice for sin,’ God ‘poureth out’ for him yet, ‘the most precious blood of His Only-Begotten:’ they (the penitents) are fed from the Cross of the Lord, because they eat His Body and Blood,’”⁴ &c. &c.,—

yet have we other testimonies from the same author that the only sacrifice acceptable to God is of that spiritual nature of which the saints of both the Old and New Testament spake, and in which the voice of the Ante-Nicene Church has spoken with no uncertain sound. Thus, in his reply to Faustus the Manichæan, when speaking of Christ being the one Sacrifice, which was made once for all in His death on the cross, Augustine says, that “this sacrifice is also *commemorated* (not *repeated*, as some vainly teach in the present day) by Christians,”⁵ when they meet to partake of the Lord’s Supper.

So also in his greatest work, entitled *The City of God*, Augustine speaks out with the utmost clearness on the spiritual nature of the Christian sacrifice, when he thus speaks:—

“True sacrifices are works of mercy to ourselves or others done with reference to God, and since works of mercy have no other object than the relief of distress or the conferring of happiness, and since there is no happiness apart from that good of which it is said, ‘It is good for me to be very near to God,’ it follows that the whole community of the saints is offered to God *as our sacrifice* through the great High Priest, who offered Himself to God in His passion for us, that we might be members of this glorious head, according to the form of a servant. *This is the sacrifice of Christians:* we, being many, are one body in Christ. And this also is the sacrifice which the Church continually celebrates in the Sacrament of the altar, known to the faithful, in which she teaches that she herself is offered in the offering that she makes to God.”⁶

⁴ *The Holy Eucharist a Comfort to the Penitent.* A Sermon by the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D., Oxford, 1843, pp. 18, 19, where all the references to Augustine’s various works are given.

⁵ Augustine’s *Reply to Faustus the Manichæan*, lib. xx. § 18.

⁶ Augustine’s *City of God*, lib. x. § 6.

Can there be any doubt as to what was the nature of the sacrifice, as understood by the Primitive Christians who represented the voice of the Ante-Nicene Church?

The idea of "sacrifice" as pertaining to Christian worship may possibly have originated, at least in England, from the desire to graft heathenish customs into the service of newly-formed Churches. Such appears to have been the aim of Pope Gregory, at the commencement of the Roman usurpation in this country, when, towards the close of the sixth century, he sent missionaries to teach the Saxons the religion of Rome, then in a sort of transition state from Christianity to Popery. Although Gregory's aim and intentions were excellent, had he ordered the monk Augustine to unite with the ancient British Church, which had existed in this country five centuries before, in place of helping the heathen to destroy it, besides manifesting that anti-Christian spirit of pride and hauteur towards its bishops and clergy which Bede, in his account of the first interview between the two parties, describes him to have shewn, the history of Christianity in England might have been very different, and the great Reformation of the sixteenth century might never have been needed. But as those whom Gregory sent here confined their work exclusively to the Saxon portion of the population, who had never received the Gospel, as the British portion had done, it was natural that Gregory should endeavour to advance what he believed to be the truth in the following way, as we may judge from the advice which he gave Abbot Mellitus, when going to join Augustine in Britain, in the year A.D. 601 :—

"When Almighty God shall have brought you to Augustine, tell him what I have determined respecting the English people after mature determination, viz., that the *idol-temples* in that nation *ought not to be destroyed*, though the idols that are in them should be. Let, therefore, *holy water* be sprinkled in the said temples, let *altars* be erected therein, and *relics* placed thereon. . . . And because the people have been accustomed to slay oxen in *sacrifices to their demons*, there ought to be some solemn rites of a similar kind, the object of them only being changed."⁷

⁷ Bede's *Eccles. Hist.*, lib. i. cap. 30.

It is evident from this extract that there was not much difference between the religion which the Saxons held before and after their possession of nominal Christianity ; and that the *sacrifices*, which they as heathens had made to their “demons,” *i.e.*, their *dead and deified heroes*, were easily transferred to the “demon” worship of dead and deified saints, which was gradually creeping into the Church of Rome, according to the apostolic prediction that “some Christians should apostatize from the faith, giving heed to doctrines of demons,” *i.e.*, of the deified dead.⁸

⁸ 1 Tim. iv. 2.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE REAL PRESENCE.

IF the fathers of the Primitive Church knew nothing of the doctrine of sacrifice as pertaining to Christians, save of that spiritual nature described in the preceding chapter, no less decisive is their testimony against what is called in the present day, as we have no reason to believe the term was invented before the nineteenth century, *The Real Objective Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ* at the Lord's Supper. And in order that we may do no injustice to the inventors and maintainers of this theory, the testimony of two of its most distinguished advocates will be adduced in order that it may be set forth in their own words. Thus Dr. Pusey, the eminent leader of the school which at one time bore his name, explains the doctrine in the following way:—

“The Church of England taught not an undefined, but a Real Objective Presence of Christ's Blessed Body and Blood. . . . She believes that the Eucharist is not a sign of an absent body, and that those who partake of it receive *not merely the figure*, or shadow, or sign of Christ's body, but the reality itself. And as Christ's divine and human natures are inseparably united, so she believes that we receive in the Eucharist, *not only the flesh and blood of Christ, but Christ Himself both God and man.*”⁹

Dr. Littledale, one of the most distinguished scholars of Dr. Pusey's following, has defined the doctrine, in a tract entitled *The Real Presence*, in these terms:—

“The Christian Church teaches, and has always taught, that in the Holy Communion, after consecration, the body and blood of our Lord Jesus

⁹ Dr. Pusey's *Eirenicon*, pp. 23, 24. Dr. Pusey has set forth this doctrine more fully in various sermons, and specially in a work entitled, *The Doctrine of the Real Presence as contained in the Fathers, from the Death of St. John the Evangelist to the Fourth General Council*. The value of these testimonies will be considered in the present chapter.

Christ are 'verily and indeed' *present on the altar*, under the forms of bread and wine. The Church also teaches that this presenee depends on God's will, not on man's belief; and, therefore, that bad and good people receive the very same thing in communicating, the good for their benefit, the bad for their condemnation. Further, that as Christ is both God and man, and as these two natures are for ever joined in His own person, His Godhead must be wherever His body is; and therefore He is to be worshipped in His Sacrament. The body and blood present are that same body and blood which were conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, ascended into heaven; but they are not present in the *same manner* as they were when Christ walked on earth. He, as man, is now *naturally* in heaven, there to be till the last day; yet He is *supernatural*, and just as truly present in the Holy Communion, in some way which we cannot explain, but only believe, knowing as we do that since He rose from the dead His body has more than human powers, as He showed by passing through closed doors. THIS IS THE DOCTRINE OF THE REAL PRESENCE."

Accepting these two statements as a faithful explanation of the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper, as held by a large party in our Church, my object will be to shew that such was *not* the doctrine held and taught by the Primitive Christians, nor is it the doctrine of the Reformed Church of England, but is essentially to all intents and purposes that of the Church of Rome. The great difference between those who hold and those who deny the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence may be summarily expressed as follows. The one party believes that our blessed Lord spoke *figuratively*, when He said of the bread which He had just broken, "This is my body," and of the cup which He had just blessed, "This is my blood of the new testament;" and also when He told the Jews, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you." The other party understood all these expressions *literally*; and affirm that "bad and good people receive the very same thing in communicating," as Dr. Littledale expresses it. In other words, the doctrine of the Real Presence is understood by its advocates to imply that Christ is received by all at the Lord's Supper, in place of being confined to the faithful alone.

Perhaps we cannot do better than repeat the testimony (partly given before) of the "judicious" Hooker, as one who is universally admitted to have expressed faithfully and plainly the true doctrine of the Church of England on this important subject. His words are as follows :—

*"The real presence of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not to be sought for in the Sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament. And with this the very order of our Saviour's words agreeth. . . . I see not which way it should be gathered by the words of Christ when and where the bread is His body or the cup His blood, but only in the very heart and soul of him who receiveth Him."*¹

That Dr. Pusey feels Hooker's definition of the doctrine of the "Real Presence" to be contrary to his own, may be fairly concluded from the following fact. In the year 1843 he published his sermon, to which we have already referred, *The Holy Eucharist a Comfort to the Penitent* : to which he has added a *catena* in the form of "Extracts from some writers in our later English Church on the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist." Amongst these extracts he has given lengthy passages from Hooker, both before and after the paragraph given above, viz., §§ 4, 5, 7, and 8, as they stand in Keble's edition of Hooker ; but for some reason he omits all notice of paragraph § 6, which contains, as plainly as words can express, Hooker's real meaning on the subject, and which certainly seem to show a difference between the teaching of Hooker and Pusey on the subject of the Real Presence. This difference may be thus explained : Hooker holds the doctrine of the Real *Spiritual* Presence ; Pusey of the Real *Objective* Presence—the one apprehended by faith, the other by the natural eye. It must be admitted that Dr. Pusey's *catena* scarcely affords a satisfactory view of Hooker's opinion upon the doctrine of the Real Presence. It rather confirms the force of a remark made by Bishop Thirlwall

¹ Hooker's *Eccles. Pol.*, b. v. c. lxvii. § 6 ; Keble's Edition, vol. ii. p. 450, Oxon. 1836. Dr. Pusey's treatment of Jeremy Taylor on the same point is just as uncandid and unfair ; *e.g.*, when the bishop writes "Christ is present *spiritually*, *i.e.*, by effect and blessing," Dr. Pusey conveniently *omits* in his quotation those all-important words,

in one of his charges, that "extracts" which pervert the author's real meaning are simply "compilations bringing the name of a *catena* into suspicion and disrepute, as equivalent to an organ of polemical delusion."

There are some grounds, however, for believing that the doctrine of the Real Presence, as explained by Drs. Pusey and Littledale, was not so held by the Tractarian party at the commencement of the Oxford movement nearly half-a-century ago; as we may conclude from the treatment of one of Keble's *Hymns* since the decease of their distinguished author. If we compare the hymn on "Gunpowder Treason," as it stands in the different editions of the *Christian Year*, we shall find in the shortest possible compass the cardinal point of the whole controversy. For if the one be scriptural, primitive, Catholic, and true, the other, which teaches directly the reverse, must of necessity be anti-scriptural, mediæval, non-Catholic, and untrue. In the early editions, *i.e.*, all which were published during the lifetime of their celebrated author, the lines read one way; in the later editions, *i.e.*, those published since his decease, they read another way, and apparently quite the reverse.

EARLY EDITIONS.

O come to our Communion Feast,
There present *in the heart*,
Not in the hands, th' Eternal Priest
Will His true self impart.

LATER EDITIONS.

O come to our Communion Feast,
There present *in the heart*,
As in the hands, th' Eternal Priest
Will His true self impart.

Mr. Keble's friends have sought to explain or to justify the alteration of the words of this hymn in the following way. Dr. Pusey, in a letter to the *Times* of Dec. 13th, 1866, says of the original reading, "Not in the hands,"—

"The words *in their strict literal meaning contradict* what had been his (Mr. Keble's) belief so long as I have heard him speak on the subject. *So taken*, they affirm that our Lord gives Himself to the soul of the receiver *only*, and is *not present objectively*. This was *not* John Keble's belief. He himself understood his own words in the same way, as when Holy Scripture says, 'I will have mercy and not sacrifice,' that the objective presence was of no avail unless our Lord was received within in the cleansed abode of the heart. . . . This is *plainly not the obvious meaning of the words*, but they satisfied him,"

Canon Liddon seeks to justify the alteration on the grounds that :—

“In Mr. Keble’s own judgment the words ‘*not in the hands*’ did not deny the objective reality of Christ’s presence in the Eucharist; for Mr. Keble used to say that the ‘*not*’ in the phrase referred to was employed in the scriptural sense of ‘*rather than*,’ instead of an ordinary sense of a direct negative.”²

Whether these explanations will prove satisfactory to the general public I am unable to say; but the difficulty of accepting them is enhanced by these facts, which can be easily rectified if wrongly stated. The first edition of the *Christian Year* was published in 1827. Froude’s *Remains* were published eight years later, in 1835; and we read in vol. i. p. 403, that Mr. Froude takes his friend Mr. Keble to task on this very point by asking him, amongst other questions of a similar kind, “Next as to the *Christian Year* on the 5th of November, ‘There present in the heart, *not in the hands*,’ &c. How can we possibly know that it is true to say, ‘*Not in the hands?*’” Surely this was the proper opportunity for Mr. Keble to set himself right with Mr. Froude, and all the world beside, if he had been so misunderstood, as Canon Liddon would have us believe. Moreover, as Keble’s edition of Hooker was published in 1836, the year following the publication of Froude’s *Remains*, and we have just seen how clearly Hooker denies Dr. Pusey’s interpretation of the doctrine of the Real Presence, we have additional proof, if such were needed, that at that period of his life the author of the *Christian Year* knew nothing of this doc-

² Canon Liddon’s Letter to the *Guardian*, dated January 3rd, 1869. Mr. Burgon, a well-known High Churchman, after expressing his opinion on Mr. Keble’s “singularly weak and unfortunate production,” entitled *Eucharistic Adoration*, remarks on the alteration alluded to in the text by observing, “In common with thousands, I hold that no greater wrong was ever done to the memory of the author of the *Christian Year* than by tampering with his great work after his death, and thereby making worse than nonsense one of the most faithful of his poems. Nor shall the discovery that others are of a different opinion persuade me either to withhold or alter mine.” (*Sermon on Romanizing within the Church of England*, by John W. Burgon, B.D., Vicar of St. Mary’s, Oxford, p. 33.)

trine other than as it was so well expressed by Dr. A. Stephens at the Bennett trial in these words:—"Given by God, not by the priest; taken by faith, *and not by the hand*; eaten by the soul, and not by the mouth."

When we recollect that at the commencement of the Oxford movement Dr. Newman made the attempt, in the celebrated Tract No. XC.,³ to show that it was possible to hold doctrines belonging essentially to the Church of Rome, and at the same time retain the *status* of an English clergyman—when we remember how repeatedly Dr. Pusey, conjointly with various periodicals belonging to his school of religious thought, has endeavoured to show there is no difference between the doctrines of the Churches of England and Rome, especially on the subject of the Lord's Supper, and has justified such an interpretation of our Articles as to admit their teaching to be in accordance with the dogmatic decrees of the Council of Trent, we are enabled to understand what Mr. Maskell, who seceded from

³ The testimony of two of our bishops, who are certainly most competent judges, respecting Tract XC., may be interesting at this crisis in the history of the Church of England. The late Bishop Phillpotts described it as "by far the most daring attempt ever yet made by a minister of the Church of England to neutralize the distinctive doctrines of our Church, and to make us symbolize with Rome." (Preface to the new edition of his work, *On the Insuperable Differences which separate the Church of England from the Church of Rome*.)

The late Archbishop Whateley wrote as follows concerning it:—"The Rev. John Newman, in that famous tract No. XC., set such an example of hair splitting and wire drawing, of shuffling equivocation, and dishonest garbling of quotations, as made the English people thoroughly ashamed that any man calling himself an Englishman, a gentleman, and a clergyman, should insult their understandings and consciences with such mean sophistry." (*Cautions for the Times*, p. 351.) These *Cautions* were published in 1853; and twelve years later Dr. Pusey replied to the archepiscopal censure by assuring the world at large that Tract No. XC. "had done good and lasting service," and that "no blame was attached either to my own vindication of the principles of Tract XC., or to that of the Rev. W. B. Heathcoat." (*Eirenicon*, p. 30.) It is difficult to understand how what was so severely blamed in 1853, should be undeserving of blame in 1865, seeing that the doctrines of the Church of England and Rome remained exactly the same at both periods.

the Church of England simultaneously with Dr. Newman, meant by saying :—

“I have heard both clergy and laity of the Church of England declare that they accept and believe all Christian truth, as it is explained in the decrees and canons of the Council of Trent. . . . Let us take one question, concerning which, to the common run of minds, the Articles of the Reformed Church of England and the Canons of Trent do seem to differ. The one asserts that ‘The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper, *only* after an heavenly manner.’ The other has this language, Sess. xiii. can. viii., ‘If any one saith that Christ, given in the Eucharist, is eaten spiritually *only*, and not also sacramentally and really, let him be anathema.’ ”⁴

Those who are unable to see the vast gulf which separates the teaching of the Church of England from that of Rome, as laid down in the formularies and authorized doctrines of each, especially in all that relates to the Lord’s Supper, must be compared to the condition of those who in the region of science come under the description of suffering from what is termed “colour blindness.”⁵ Those of our clergy and laity who conscientiously declare there is no difference between the two, are thus described by Mr. Maskell in the pamphlet quoted above :—

“It is curious, to say the least of it, and probably was never made by any one who had read and understood the Tridentine Canons. But as to clergymen, ignorance cannot be supposed; and for them, bound as they are by subscription to our formularies, thus to speak, has always seemed to me amongst the greatest of all achievements of human intellect. Subtle as we know the mind of man to be, and wide its range, I cannot but confess that the more I think of it, the more I am amazed at so wonderful an example of its power and capability.”

Mr. Maskell’s sarcasm on those clergy who remain in communion with the Church of England while holding all Roman

⁴ *A Second Letter on the Present Position of the High Church Party in the Church of England*, by the Rev. W. Maskell, pp. 64, 65.

⁵ Professor Tyndal mentions that the Quaker Dalton, the modern reviver of the Atomic theory, “could only distinguish by their form ripe *red* cherries from the *green* leaves of the tree. The defect is called *colour blindness*, and sometimes Daltonism,” (*Notes on Light*, p. 41.)

doctrine, is supplemented by the sterner, but deserved rebuke of the late Bishop Phillpotts, who is reported by Mr. Maskell as having said :—

“ I cannot understand how any man can place himself, his affections, and sympathies so totally in opposition to the authority which he has sworn to obey, and to the Church in which he ministers. When I look at the spirit and tone of the Church of England, I am at a loss to reconcile such a course of action with my sense of what is right, and true, and straightforward.”

Then alluding to a recent secession to the Church of Rome, he continued,—

“ I hope it will be a lesson to those who use Roman Catholic books of devotion ; and I can only say, the sooner they follow such an example the better : *they are disloyal and dishonest members of the Church of England.*”

The repeated boastings of the organs of the Ritualists that the Church of England, “ in faith, orders, and sacraments,” is one with the Church of Rome ;—the renewed attempts of Dr. Pusey and others to put in practice the reasoning and principles of Tract No. XC. ;—the discovery by the late Archbishop Longley of the behaviour and teaching of the clergy at St. Saviour’s, Leeds, as given under their own hand, whose language, as he says in his posthumous charge, “ is entirely incompatible with loyalty to the Church to which they profess to belong ; they remain with us in order that they may substitute the Mass for the Communion, the obvious aim of our Reformers having been to substitute the Communion for the Mass ;”—the announcement in the House of Lords by the present Archbishop of Canterbury during the debates on the Public Worship Regulation Bill, that a work⁶ had been published combining the Communion Service of the Church of England with that of the Mass used in the Latin Church, by which

⁶ The exact title of this work is as follows : — “ THE RITUAL OF THE ALTAR : containing the Office of Holy Communion, with Rubrical Directions, Private Prayers, and Ritual Music. *According to the use of the Church of England, &c.* Edited by the Rev. Orby Shipley, M.A.” The editor, in the Preface, endeavours to offer an apology for one of the most flagrant instances of treachery which theological controversy has ever produced ; but every honest man is compelled to scout with indignation both the apology and the work itself.

means a clergyman with Roman proclivities could outwardly appear to the congregation to be using the service of the Church of England, which he was sworn to use "and none other," while secretly he was satisfying the cravings of his heart by adopting the ritual and doctrine of the mass pertaining to the Church of Rome;—all these things, and many other incidents of a similar nature, which are too numerous to be detailed, are slowly convincing the English nation that there are, as some of our bishops have had courage to confess, a band of clergy in our Reformed Church, who are determined, *coûte que coûte*, if possible, to bring us back in bondage to the Roman see. Their writings and practices, together with the secession of the more candid and honest members of their party, all tend to prove that in place of Bishop Hall's famous aphorism two centuries ago, "*No peace with Rome*," their unceasing object is to make peace with Rome; as the *Union Review*, one of the ablest of their organs, frankly confesses:—

"The work going on in England is an earnest and carefully organized attempt on the part of a rapidly-increasing body of priests and laymen to bring our Church and country up to the full standard of the Catholic faith and practice, and eventually to plead for her union with the see of St. Peter. We give the people *the real doctrine of the mass*. The name will come by and bye. So with regard to the worship of the Virgin; *we are one with the Roman Catholics in faith*, and have a common foe to fight."

Seeing then these frank avowals on all sides of the unity of their Church with that of Rome on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, and which is defined by the Ritualist under the term "the Real Objective Presence," and by the Romanist under that of "Transubstantiation," which our Church has very faithfully declared to be "repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, to overthrow the nature of a sacrament, and to have given occasion to many superstitions,"⁷ and which necessarily includes "adoration" of the sacramental bread and wine, which is "idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians,"⁸ we

⁷ Article XXVIII.

⁸ Black Rubric at the end of the Communion Service.

must now consider how the Primitive Christians understood the doctrine of the Real Presence, whether figuratively and spiritually, or objectively and materially. Dr. Pusey, who denies the former, necessarily adopts the latter. The late Bishop Phillpotts has so well expressed the converse of such views, that we cannot do better than quote his words on the subject, thus :—

“The crucified Jesus is present in the Sacrament of His Supper, not *in*, nor *with*, the bread and wine, nor *under the accidents* ; but in the souls of the communicants. That *this is the doctrine of our Church on the Real Presence*, I prove by reference to these words of Art. 28 : ‘To such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same,’” &c.⁹

The *Guardian* of March 29th, 1871, on the other hand, in its attempt to screen those who cling to the doctrine of the “Real Objective Presence,” as interpreted by Dr. Pusey, says in its review of a work entitled, *Reasons for Returning to the Church of England* :—

“We are suspicious of the comprehensiveness and depth of a writer who cites with approbation Tillotson’s *shallow and perilous objection* against Transubstantiation.”

Now, inasmuch as Archbishop Tillotson’s objection is expressed in these words :—“The Bible contains the whole belief of the Church of God ; and as we find nothing of transubstantiation there, we might satisfy ourselves with giving the assertions of the holy fathers of the Council a broad denial : some of the greatest writers and divines, even of the Romish Church, admit that the doctrine cannot be proved from the Bible”—we may easily judge to whom the accusation of “shallowness,” whether to the reviewer or the primate, more properly belongs. The best reply to the false doctrine respecting the Lord’s Supper, whether termed that of the “Real Objective Presence” or of “Transubstantiation,” strange to say, comes from the great heathen philosopher Cicero, who, while condemning the follies of the doctrine propounded by the Pagan priests and their ignorant and superstitious followers, says :—

⁹ *Letters to the late Charles Butler, &c.*, p. 121, edition of 1866.

“When we call wine *Bacchus*, and our fruits *Ceres*, we use the *common mode of speaking*; but can you think any person so mad as to imagine that what he eats to be a god.”¹

To come now to the testimony of the Primitive Church respecting the doctrine of the “Real Objective Presence.” Did the Primitive Christians understand that when our Lord uttered these words, “This is my body,” “This is my blood,” He was speaking in symbolical and *figurative* language? Or did they understand that at the Lord’s Supper, the consecrated elements of bread and wine became so changed into the body and blood of Christ, that the real object of their Master’s presence was then present to all good and bad alike, which it was lawful for them to worship and adore? St. Augustine lays down a very good rule for the interpretation of Scripture, which it may be well to note, as we shall see how it was carried out by the fathers of the Primitive Church. He says what is peculiarly pertinent to the subject we are now discussing:—

“If the sentence contains a command, either forbidding crime or vice, or enjoining acts of usefulness or benevolence, *it is not figurative*. If, however, it appears to command any crime or vice, or to forbid acts of usefulness or benevolence, *it is figurative*. As when Christ says, ‘Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you.’ This seems to enjoin a crime or vice; *it is, therefore, a figure*, enjoining that we should have a share of the sufferings of our Lord, and that we should retain a sweet and profitable memory of the fact that His flesh was wounded and crucified for us.”²

¹ Cicero, *De Naturâ Deorum*, lib. iii. cap. 28. This sensible remark of the celebrated *heathen* philosopher agrees with a saying of a *Christian* philosopher of the primitive age, viz., Clement of Alexandria, who writes: “It were indeed ridiculous, as the philosophers themselves admit, for man, the plaything of God, *to make God*, and for God to be the plaything of art.” (*Stromata*, lib. vii. cap. 5.)

² Augustine, *On Christian Doctrine*, lib. iii. cap. 16, § 24. As Dr. Little-dale, in his tract on *The Real Presence*, appears to consider the Roman Cardinal Cajetan, in the sixteenth century, to be the *first* who set aside John VI., as having nothing to do with the Lord’s Supper, it is sufficient to point out that Augustine, twelve centuries before Cajetan’s time, so considered it, especially as in his work on St. John’s Gospel he sets forth the same

(1.) Hence we find the fathers of the Primitive Church speaking very decidedly on this point. Let Ignatius, or the author of the Epistle to the Trallians, attributed to him, be our first witness:—

“Wherefore, putting on meekness, renew yourself in *faith, which is the flesh of the Lord*; and in love, which is the blood of Jesus Christ.”³

(2.) Justin Martyr, writing against his Jewish opponent, says:—

“The bread of the Eucharist was *a figure*, which Christ the Lord commanded to be celebrated in memory of His passion.”⁴

(3.) Clemens Alexandrinus writes:—

“Faith is our food Our Lord, in the Gospel of St. John, has *by means of figures* set forth such food as this. For when He says, ‘Eat my flesh and drink my blood, He is evidently *allegorising* the drinkableness of faith.”⁵

(4.) Tertullian speaks with still more distinctness on this point, for he writes:—

“The bread which Christ took and distributed to His disciples, He made His body, by saying, ‘This is my body,’ *i.e., the figure of my body.*”⁶

(5.) Irenæus relates, concerning the heathen, that they used to seize the servants of the Christians, and apply torture to them in order—

“To extort from them the disclosure of some secret abomination of the Christians, these servants having nothing to tell that would gratify their tormentors, except that they heard their masters say, *the Holy Communion* was the body and blood of Christ; thinking it was really His body, they reported the same to the enquirers. Accordingly these latter, supposing this was actually the Christian mystery, made the same report to the rest of the heathen, and forced the martyrs Sanctus and Blandina by torture to

primitive doctrine most fully, summing it all up in this one emphatic sentence: “*Believe, and thou hast eaten already.*” (*Tractate XXV. § 12.*) This is the doctrine of the Reformed Church of England.

³ Ignat., *ad Trall.*, cap. viii.

⁴ Justin, *Dial. cum Trypho.*, § 41.

⁵ Clem. Alex., *Pædagog.*, lib. i. cap. 6.

⁶ Tertull., *Adv. Marcion.*, lib. iv. cap. 11.

confession. To whom Blandina made answer well and bravely, ‘*How could we endure to do such an act, who in the practice of our Christian discipline abstain even from permitted food?*’⁷

(6.) Origen, in reply to the heresy of the Marcionites, writes:—

“If, as the Marcionites affirm, Christ had neither flesh nor blood, of what flesh, or body, or blood, are the cup, which He delivered, the *images*. By these *figures* He commended His memory to His disciples.”⁸

Elsewhere Origen observes:—

“We are said to drink the blood of Christ, not only by way of the Sacraments, *but also when we receive His word*, wherein consisteth life, as He Himself says: ‘the words which I have spoken are spirit and life.’”⁹

(7.) Eusebius, Bishop of Cæsarea, A.D. 325, says:—

“Christ gave to His disciples the *figures* of divine economy, commanding the image of His own body to be made. . . . The disciples of Christ received a command, according to the principles of the New Testament, to make a memorial of this sacrifice upon the table, *by the figures of His body* and saving blood.”¹

Thus much for the testimony of the Ante-Nicene Church, to whom more peculiarly the title of “Primitive,” in a liberal sense, may be said to belong; and it will be sufficient to observe, that for centuries the great writers of the Post-Nicene Church, such as Macarius, (a bishop in Egypt,) Athanasius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory Nazianzen, Ambrose, (Bishop of Milan,) Jerome, St. Augustine, Chrysostom, Gelasius, (Bishop of Rome, A.D. 496,) Facundus, (Bishop of Hermiana in Africa, A.D. 540,) and others, all with undeviating uniformity upheld this important truth, that at the Lord’s Supper, to use the words of the great Augustine, “*our Lord took and delivered to His disciples*

⁷ Irenæus, *Frag. de Perd. Oper.*, ab Occ. in Com. ad 1 Pet. Ep. cap. iii., Paris, 1716.

⁸ Origen, *Dial. Contr. Marcion*, iii.

⁹ Origen, *in Numb.*, cap. 24. *Homil.* 16.

¹ Euseb., *Demonst. Evangel.*, lib. i. cap. ult; and lib. viii. cap. i.

the figure of His body and blood;"² so that for Dr. Pusey or any other writer in the present day to deny this evident fact, is a melancholy proof of the way in which strong partizanship is apt to obscure the spiritual vision of the most devoted of men when determined to support an untenable theory.

But Dr. Pusey, apparently conscious of the difficulty that the Primitive Christians invariably explained Christ's words, "This is my body," in a *figurative* sense, asserts "that they did *not* mean figures of an absent body; but that there was a real *visible substance*, which was the image or symbol of the *present* spiritual invisible substance. Tertullian says, '*In* the bread is understood His body,'"³ and the meaning of the word "*in*" he explains in another work, thus:—"The word *in*, like the word of our *Book of Homilies*, '*under* the form of bread and wine,' only expresses a *Real Presence* under that outward veil."⁴

In reply to what Dr. Pusey pronounces to be the teaching of the Church of England, in her *Book of Homilies*, respecting the force of the term, "*under* the form of bread and wine," there is this explanation, which he has omitted to give. In an advertisement which was appended to the First Book of Homilies, printed in 1547, before the doctrine of *Transubstantiation* had been formally repudiated by the Reformed Church of England, appeared the following words: "Hereafter shall follow sermons of fasting, &c., of the due receiving of His (Christ's) blessed body and blood, *under the form of bread and wine*," &c. Now this advertisement, though of course *forming no part of the Book of Homilies*, was repeated by succeeding printers in all their editions of the First Book, and even after the *Second Book* had been added, in which a Homily had been given on the subject, maintaining a totally different doctrine from that implied in

² August. in *Psalm* 3. Elsewhere Augustine says: "The Lord hesitated not to say, 'This is my body,' when He gave a sign of His body." (*Contra Ademais*, cap. 12.)

³ *The Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist*. A Sermon by Dr. Pusey, pp. 39, 40.

⁴ *The Doctrine of the Real Presence*, by Dr. Pusey, p. 132.

the printer's advertisement, as the first part of Homily XXVII. clearly shows by these words :—

“As St. Ambrose saith, he is unworthy of the Lord that otherwise doth celebrate that mystery (the Lord's Supper) otherwise than it was delivered by Him. *We must then take heed, lest, of the memory, it be made a sacrifice.* What hath been the cause of the ruin of God's religion but the ignorance hereof? *i.e.*, profaning of the Lord's Supper by the Corinthians. What hath been the cause of this *gross idolatry* but the ignorance hereof? What hath been the cause of this *mummish massing* but the ignorance hereof? Let us so understand the Lord's Supper, that there be *no idolatry*, no dumb massing. ‘Therefore, (saith Cyprian) when we do these things, we need not to whet our teeth; but with sincere faith we break and divide that holy bread.’ It is well known that the meat we seek for in this Supper is *spiritual* food, the nourishment of our soul, a heavenly refection and not earthly, an invisible meat, and not *bodily*.”⁵

I believe the late Archdeacon Wilberforce, who honestly seceded to Rome, when he learnt what the Reformed Church of England really taught concerning the Lord's Supper, was the first to put forth this misrepresentation of what the Book of Homilies really taught on the subject of the “Real Objective Presence;” for to assert that the Church of England teaches the doctrine of Christ's Presence at the Lord's Supper, “*under the form of bread and wine*,” because a printer introduced the term in an advertisement to the First Book of Homilies before our Church underwent that Reformation which was subsequently vouchsafed to her, betrays, to say the least, a conscious weakness in the theory which its advocates are determined to uphold at all hazards. It is difficult to explain such reasoning

⁵ It would be far more apposite, in place of quoting a printer's advertisement as expressive of the doctrine of the Reformed Church of England, to notice the extracts from the *Articles and Communion Service*, and Bishop Jewel's *Apology*, and Dean Nowell's *Catechism*, attached to some editions of the Book of Homilies at the end of Homily XXVII., part 2, which set forth the true doctrine of the Lord's Supper, as authoritatively taught by our Church, viz.: “The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, *only* after an heavenly and spiritual manner; and *the mean* whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is *Faith*.” (Article XXVIII.)

upon any other principle than that avowed by Dr. J. H. Newman, whose memorable definition of truth has been often quoted as follows :—

“The Christian both thinks and speaks the truth, *except* when consideration is necessary ; and then as a physician, for the good of his patients, he will be false, or *utter a falsehood*, as the sophists say. Nothing, however, but his neighbour’s good will lead him to do this. *He gives himself up for the Church.*”⁶

This peculiar defence of untruthfulness, on behalf of what its advocates assume to be “the Catholic Church,” is more boldly defended by the founder of the Jesuits, who declares, “that we may in all things attain to the truth, and not err in anything : we ought to hold it as a fixed principle that what I see white I believe to be black, if the hierarchial Church so defines it to be.”⁷ Very striking is the contrast which such ethics present to the Christian apothegm of Bacon, respecting the state of every well-regulated mind in its passage through life, as he beautifully expresses it : “For certainly it is heaven upon earth to have a man’s mind move in charity, rest in Providence, and turn upon the poles of TRUTH.”⁸

To return, however, to the treatment of Tertullian. Dr. Pusey contends, as we have already seen, that when Tertullian says, “*In* the bread is understood His body,” he meant that “*under* the form of bread and wine,” we have the doctrine of *the Real Objective Presence* in the Lord’s Supper as taught and believed by the Primitive Church. A reference, however, to

⁶ Newman’s *Arians of the Fourth Century*, p. 72.

⁷ *Exercises of St. Ignatius Loyola*, edited by the late Cardinal Wiseman. As an instance of the similarity of teaching respecting “truth” between Rome and the heathen, the Abbé Hue, in his *Travels in China*, relates an interesting conversation between himself and a literary mandarin, who remarked : “Your mandarins are more fortunate than ours. Our emperor cannot know everything, yet he is judge of everything, and no one dares find fault with any of his actions. Our emperor says, ‘That is white ;’ and we prostrate ourselves, and say, ‘Yes, it is white.’ He shows us the same object afterwards, and says, ‘That is black ;’ and we prostrate ourselves again and say, ‘Yes, it is black.’”

⁸ Bacon’s *Essays*, I.—*Of Truth*,

the context will show that Tertullian's words will bear no such construction as Dr. Pusey endeavours to impose upon them. His words are :—

“We should rather understand ‘Give us this day our daily bread,’ *spiritually*. For Christ is our bread, because Christ is life and bread is life. ‘I am,’ saith He, ‘the Bread of Life;’ and a little before, ‘The bread is the word of the living God, who came down from the heavens.’ Then, again, we find that *His body is reckoned to be in bread*,’ ‘This is my body.’ And so in praying for ‘daily bread,’ we ask for perpetuity in Christ, and indivisibility from His body. But because that Word is admissible in a carnal sense likewise, it cannot be so used without the religious remembrance of spiritual discipline; for He commands that ‘*bread*’ be prayed for, which is the only food necessary for believers, as ‘all other things the nations seek after.’ The like lesson He both inculcates by examples, and repeatedly handles in parables.”⁹

When we remember that Tertullian, in another of his works, as we have already seen, declares that “the bread which Christ gave to His disciples meant *the figure of His body*,” we see how little support Dr. Pusey can really obtain for his theory of the “Real Objective Presence” from anything which Tertullian has really stated; and I cannot help thinking that any one who will give a candid and impartial examination of the passages adduced by Dr. Pusey from the fathers of the Primitive Church in favour of his theory, will arrive at the same conclusion.¹ It is true that Dr. Pusey declares, respecting the patristic testimony which he has adduced in support of his own view, “I have *suppressed* nothing; I have not knowingly omitted anything; I have given *every passage*, as far as in me lay, *with so much of the context* as was necessary for the clear exhibition of its meaning;”² but I have given specimens of his treatment of Tertullian in ancient times and Hooker in modern, and

⁹ Tertullian, *On Prayer*, ch. vi.

¹ This has been done completely and exhaustively by Dr. Harrison, Vicar of Fenwick, in his very valuable works, entitled, *An Answer to Dr. Pusey's Challenge Respecting the Doctrine of the Real Presence; The Fathers versus Dr. Pusey*; and *An Answer, in Seven Tracts, to the Eucharistic Doctrine of Romanists and Ritualists*.

² Pusey's *Doctrine of the Real Presence*, p. 715.

Dr. Harrison has given many more, to show that such a broad statement must be received with some limitation; as the least we can say is that Dr. Pusey does not seem to be aware how very much his "omissions" tend to invalidate the force of his reasons. For example, in the case of Hooker, to which we have before alluded, what can be stronger than his words that "the real presence is not to be sought for in the Sacrament, but only in the very heart and soul of him which receiveth Christ," on one side of the question, as Dr. Pusey's are on the other? When, therefore, we see Dr. Pusey, in his sermon entitled, *Will ye also go away?* asserting that if "it should be decided by competent authority that either the '*Real Objective Presence*,' or the '*Eucharistic sacrifice*,' or the worship of Christ there present, were contrary to the doctrine held by the Church of England, I would resign my office," we can the easier understand why Dr. Pusey, in giving a catena of "some writers in our later English Church on the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist," Hooker among the number, should have "omitted" that portion of Hooker's writings which speaks clearly against that doctrine which Dr. Pusey consistently upholds. It is scarcely necessary for me to add, what I believe I am right in asserting, that were it declared by "competent authority" that either of the three points, as enunciated by Dr. Pusey, were those of the Church of England, or, to use legal language, of the "Protestant Reformed Religion established by law"³ in this country, every Evangelical clergyman would at once quit the Church of his forefathers, with the assured conviction that "*I-chu-bod*" was written on her walls, and that she had departed from the Primitive and Catholic faith, and that in consequence "the glory (of Christ) had departed" from her.

Those who know what the Apostle terms "the truth as in Jesus," cannot recognise any distinction between such teaching so formulated under the high sounding title of the "Real Objective Presence," and that more candid expression of

³ Coronation Oath taken by every British Sovereign since the Revolution of 1688. See Phillimore's *Ecclesiastical Law*, i. p. 1060.

“Transubstantiation,” as employed by the Church of Rome, which Dr. Pusey,⁴ with such painful ingenuity, endeavours to prove is in harmony with the doctrine of the Church of England, but which every one, unbiassed by a peculiar species of theological training, knows to be wide as the poles asunder. For not only does the Church of England teach by her *Articles* that “the change of the substance of the bread and wine in the Supper of the Lord is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, and overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament;”⁵ but also that the only “Sacrifice” of which our Church knows anything, as we have already pointed out, is that of “ourselves, our souls and bodies,” and which she properly terms “a reasonable, holy and lively sacrifice unto Thee;” and as to any “worship of Christ present at the Eucharistic Sacrifice,” as Dr. Pusey contends, or “the real, actual, and *visible* Presence of our Lord upon the altars of our churches,” as Mr. Bennett expresses it, the Church of England has emphatically and formally condemned that doctrine as “Idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians.” And, as if to show how faithfully she adheres to the teaching of the Primitive Christians by affirming that it is “*only* after an heavenly and *spiritual* manner that Christ is received and eaten in the Supper,” and that by “faith” alone, which is the direct converse of the doctrine for which Dr. Pusey is so earnestly contending, it will be sufficient to show that the Church of England, in the third rubric of the service of the Communion of the Sick, teaches as follows:—

“If any man, either by reason of sickness, . . . or by any other just impediment, do not receive the Sacrament of Christ’s Body and Blood, the

⁴ Although I have been compelled in this chapter to criticise freely what Dr. Pusey has written on this important doctrine, I desire to express the unfeigned respect which I have ever entertained for so eminent a person. His personal devotion, his uncontroversial writings, especially those on the subject of Divine love, the Christian way in which he has spoken in his *Eirenicon* of the Evangelical party in our Church,—all these things demand a sincere and hearty recognition on our part, which I for one feel it a privilege most readily to give.

⁵ Article XXVIII.

curate shall instruct him, that *if he do truly repent* him of his sins, and steadfastly believe that Jesus Christ hath suffered death upon the cross for him, . . . *he doth eat and drink the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ profitably to his soul's health, although he do not receive the Sacrament with his mouth.*"

Canon Rawlinson⁶ is reported to have said that "the whole question at stake is, in fact, that of *the Real Presence*," but he should rather have said "the Real Objective Presence;" for there is no doubt that the Church of England, like the Primitive Christians, teaches the doctrine of the faithful believer realizing the spiritual presence of his Saviour in his heart, both when receiving the Lord's Supper, and at other times as well, and this may be and is termed by some the doctrine of the Real Presence; but this is something very different from what Dr. Pusey, in accordance with the Church of Rome, means by the term the Real *Objective* Presence. Once he thought fit to rest his defence of that doctrine upon the grounds, as he expressed it, that the martyr, Bishop Latimer, "*shortly* before his death, went far beyond" himself in his advocacy of that and other Roman doctrines; but Dr. Pusey made a grave mistake in asserting that it was "*shortly*" before his martyrdom that Latimer held this doctrine, for upon examination it appears that it was at least twenty-two years before his death, in the year 1533, when he was a rigid Papist, and before a ray of Gospel light had penetrated his soul, that Bishop Latimer was an upholder of this un-Catholic doctrine, viz., that of what the Church of Rome then called "Transubstantiation," but which Dr. Pusey prefers to term in the present day the doctrine of the "Real Objective Presence."⁷

If, therefore, we use this term of Dr. Pusey's own selection, we are obliged to assert there is a wide distinction, a vast

⁶ *The Rubrical Question* of 1874, by Canon Swainson, p. 7.

⁷ See *Church and State Review*, Jan. 26th, 1866. I observe the *Guardian* of July 22nd, 1874, after charging the Evangelicals with ignorance on this subject, asserts that Bishop Latimer defended the doctrine of the *Real Presence* "*not long before his death*, as most fitly expressing his own faith,"

fathomless gulf between his teaching on the subject of Christ's Objective Presence at the Lord's Supper, when he asserts a perfect uniformity of doctrine with that of Rome,⁸ and that spiritual presence, which has been so well defined by Hooker, which was received and taught by the Primitive Christians in ancient times, as it is with equal fidelity by the Reformed Church of England in modern days, and which confines the blessing connected with it to those and those only who spiritually receive Christ in their hearts by faith, and which may be done at all times and in all places through the mighty power of God the Holy Ghost.

From a review of the patristic testimonies adduced in the present chapter, we think two points stand out very clear. 1st. That Dr. Pusey has no warrant for asserting that the fathers rejected the *figurative* application of our Lord's words,—"This is my body;" "This cup⁹ is the new testament of my blood;" "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man," &c.; and, likewise, that in his *catena*, "From some writers in our later English Church on the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist," Dr. Pusey has made such grave *omissions*, "in packing his evidence," and "in schooling his witnesses," as the late Isaac Taylor termed it in his *Ancient Christianity*, as not only to bring the name of a *catena* into signal disrepute, but he has, though doubtless unintentionally, sacrificed truth for the sake

⁸ Dr. Pusey's words, in his address to the *English Church Union* of 1866, were, "I believe that the Council of Trent, whatever its look may be, and our Articles, whatever their look may be, each could be so explained as to be *reconcilable one with the other.*"

⁹ Bishop Jeremy Taylor forcibly observes, in his work on *Transubstantiation*, that "all men, in fact, whatever may be their pretences, must come to the *figurative* at last." Respecting St. Luke's report of Christ's words, at the institution of the Lord's Supper, "This cup," &c., he asks, "To what can *touto* refer but to *poterion*, 'this cup?' and let whatsoever sense be affixed to it afterwards, if it do not suppose a *figure*, then there is no such thing as figures or words, or truth or things." (Sect. 5.) Then the bishop goes on to show that "there is in the words of institution such a heap of *tropes* and *figurative* speeches, that almost in every word there is *plainly a trope.*" (Sect. 6.)

of the party which has so long traded upon his honoured name.¹

2nd. It is no less evident that, notwithstanding the cloud of words under which the Ritualists seek to mystify the public in general, and the weaker members of their party in particular, they teach exactly the same as the Church of Rome on the cardinal doctrine of the Eucharist, whether called by the name of the "Real Objective Presence," or the older and better known term of "Transubstantiation." The more honest

¹ We have already seen instances of Dr. Pusey's treatment of those authors, whom he seeks, by skilful omissions, to adduce in favour of his own peculiar views, whereas in reality, when the *lacunæ* are supplied, they tell against him. Mr. Henry Rogers, in one of his valuable *Essays on Theological Controversies*, says of that class of controversialists: "They can leave out, if they do not put in; can insulate a plausible sentence or two from a qualifying or refractory contest, and manage commas and colons to admiration. Some ingenious examples of this literary *joinery* may be found in Bishop McIlvaine's *Oxford Divinity compared with that of the Romish and Anglican Churches*, p. 232. For instance, they cite a passage from the Homilies which appears not unfriendly to a doctrine they affirm; but on reference to the original it is found that they have taken only the *beginning* and end of the paragraph, the intermediate part which they have *omitted* being altogether against it; but no breaks, asterisks, dots, or other indications are employed to suggest that there has been any 'solution of continuity' in the citation; on the contrary, the *disjecta membra* are represented as so immediately connected that they are separated only by a semicolon!" (P. 80.)

Of Dr. Pusey's controversial writings in particular, he observes: "Obscure and apparently self-contradictory in statement, feeble and prolix in style, in some parts a mere tissue of scraps and fragments from the fathers, and certainly not relieved by the soporiferous appendix of some sixty pages of tedious citations from English divines, . . . all Dr. Pusey's polemical productions are insupportably heavy both in point of matter and style. His page is so *tattooed* with quotations and references, that it is hardly possible to discover the native complexion of his own thoughts. Many a page of his tedious work on baptism is little else than a patchwork of quotations from the fathers, flounced with a deep margin of references. He reminds us of that class of conversialists of whom Milton says, 'When they have, like good sumpters, laid you down their horse-load of citations and fathers at your door, you may take off their pack-saddles; their day's work is done.'" (Pages 116, 117.)

members of the party candidly declare, as we have already seen, that they are "one in sacraments" with the Papacy, and that "the Church of England holds precisely the same view of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper as the Church of Rome." The less candid members fence with the question, like Mr. Bennett, when examined before the Royal Commission on Ritual, pretending they do not understand what "Transubstantiation" really means. Such being their ignorance, it may be well to enlighten them by the definition which some of our master-divines have given of this mysterious ecclesiastical term. "Transubstantiation," said the very learned Selden, "is nothing but rhetoric turned into logic." South called it "the most stupendous piece of nonsense that ever was owned in the face of a rational world." And Bishop Jeremy Taylor scrupled not to say, in his long enumeration of its absurdities, "By this doctrine, the same thing stays in a place and goes away from it; it removes from itself, and yet abides close by itself and in itself, and out of itself. It is brought from heaven to earth, and yet is nowhere in the way, nor ever stirs out of heaven. It makes a thing contained bigger than that which contains it, and all Christ's body to go into a part of His body; His whole head into His own mouth, if He did eat the Eucharist, as it is probable He did, and certain that He might have done."

The following anecdote will illustrate what is logically required by the Church of Rome to be held as an "article of the faith," or rather the *ne plus ultra* of superstition, respecting "Transubstantiation." The late Mr. Drummond, one of the "apostles" of the Irvingite Church, naturally adopted the extreme sacerdotal principles of that body, without going to the full extent of receiving the doctrine of Transubstantiation. Once, when residing at Rome, it was thought by the Roman zealots that his doubts might be removed, and so the general of the Jesuits undertook to visit him, and make the subject plain to the wished-for proselyte. An interview accordingly took place, with the following result. The general of the Jesuits having explained what "the Church" required of the faithful to believe concerning "Transubstantiation," Mr. Drummond

asked whether it was the doctrine of "the Church" that natural bread and wine were so changed by the act of consecration as to become what they were not before? The general replied, "Beyond all doubt." "Then," said Mr. Drummond, "supposing that some great chemist were allowed to analyze the elements after consecration, would they find any change to have taken place?" The general paused, and then said, "Sir, if such an impiety were to take place, I believe the elements would be found restored to their natural state." Mr. Drummond rejoined, "Then I understand that in this case the elements would be the subject of two miracles. By the act of *consecration* one miracle would be performed, by which they would be transubstantiated into the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ; but by the act of *desecration* a second miracle would be performed, whereby the elements would be restored to their *natural* state." The general of the Jesuits could bear this no longer; his face reddened, and he rose in great wrath, saying, "Sir, I perceive that you are only a speculator, and not at all disposed to hear the Church; and let me tell you that if you continue in your present state, *you will infallibly go to hell.*" Mr. Drummond thanked the angry priest for the warm interest which he took in his welfare, and so they parted.

Can the force of superstition further go? And we may feel assured that the argument which tells so conclusively against the Roman doctrine of "Transubstantiation," is equally applicable to the Ritualistic definition of the same dogma, only better known to us by its modern appellation of the "Real Objective Presence." For, as the late Bishop Blomfield in one of his charges well said:—

"I am thoroughly persuaded that to embrace the notion of any corporal Presence of our Lord in the Eucharist is virtually to embrace the doctrine of *Transubstantiation*; and when that is once received a door is opened for the easy admission of all the errors and superstitions of the Church of Rome."

CHAPTER IX.

VESTMENTS.

THE approximation of professing Christian ministers to heathen customs, in carrying out to their full extent what they conceive to be the proper mode of "celebrating the Eucharistic Sacrifice," as they fondly term it, will be more completely seen in continuing our consideration of the subject under the three-fold heads of VESTMENTS, LIGHTS, and INCENSE, for which the Ritualists of the last few years have been so earnestly struggling; and which have now been pronounced *illegal* by the supreme authority in the Church of England.²

It is well known to all who have investigated the subject, that in the earliest ages the costume of the Christian ministry was identical with that ordinarily used by clergy and laity alike on festive occasions. I give the testimony of two high authorities on each side of the question in confirmation of the above assertion.

Dr. Rock, a learned priest of the Church of Rome, says:—

"From the concurrent testimony of writers who have bestowed much laborious research upon the subject, it appears that, during the infancy of the Christian religion, the garments worn by her priesthood, when employed in offering up the holy Eucharistic sacrifice, were *identically the same in form*, and composed of similar materials, with those corresponding articles of dress in the ordinary apparel adopted by persons of condition at that period.

"The costume of civil society underwent a perfect, but gradual transformation. In process of time those garments which once were universally

² See the judgments in the cases of *Martyn v. Mackonochie*, and *Hebbert v. Purchas*, as delivered by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and confirmed by the Queen's Majesty as Supreme Ordinary of the Church of England.

worn without regard to age, or station, or employment, by the more respectable members of society, became peculiar to the servants of the altar. *This began to be discernible about the close of the sixth century.*"³

The late Mr. Wharton Marriott, an equally learned Presbyterian of the Church of England, thus delivers his opinion on the subject of *vestments* :—

"Among those who have examined the question upon purely historical or antiquarian evidence, the more general opinion is such as this :—that in the apostolic age there was no essential difference between the dress worn by Christians in ordinary life and that worn by bishops, priests, or other clerics, when engaged in offices of holy ministration ; but that, after the lapse of three or four centuries, the dress of ordinary life became changed, while that worn in ecclesiastical offices remained in form unchanged, though ever more and more richly decorated. That from these causes a marked distinction was gradually brought about between the dress of the clergy and that of the laity ; that, as time went on, the ordinary dress of the clergy themselves came to be distinguished, in form, in colour, and in name, from that in which they ministered ; while, at length, yet a further distinction was introduced as between the dress of the more ordinary ministrations and the more splendid *vestments* reserved for the highest offices of all, and for occasions of special solemnity."⁴

³ Rock's *Hierurgia*, p. 414.

⁴ *Vestiarium Christianum. The Origin and Gradual Development of the Dress of the Holy Ministry in the Church*, by the Rev. Wharton B. Marriott, ch. i. p. 11. The late lamented author mentioned to me a curious anecdote in connexion with this work, which illustrates the mistakes which heated partizans are sometimes liable to make. In plate lxiii. there is a representation given of the "vestments" worn by the clergy at four different periods, showing a certain amount of uniformity in all. The first "from the Roman Catacombs, third or fourth century ;" the second "from Trebizond, thirteenth century ;" the third "from Florence, fifteenth century ;" and the last "from England, nineteenth century," representing an English clergyman, of a stern and unhappy countenance, with eyes bent low towards the ground, in the ordinary dress of surplice, hood, and scarf, such as has existed in the Church of England since the Reformation of the sixteenth century. A reviewer in a Ritualistic periodical of an advanced type, eagerly seized the opportunity of abusing the Low Church party, as he thought, by pointing out in a review of the work in question, that the last figure in the plate was evidently one of the sour, crabbed Calvinistic clergy, slowly pacing along the ground while meditating upon the damnation of those around him who did not belong to his sect. On reading this charitable

It was with a view to return to primitive customs as far as practicable, that our Reformers banished all the various “vestments” in public service, by which the Church of Rome, after the manner of the heathen, had so long endeavoured to disfigure the simplicity of the Gospel of Christ. Hence Thomas Becon, Cranmer’s chaplain, in his *Catechism* of 1547, justly observes :—

“When our Lord did minister the Sacrament *He used none but His own common and daily apparel*, and so likewise did the Apostles after Him, and the *Primitive Church* used that order ; and so it was continued many years after, till superstition began to creep into the Church.”

It is not difficult to understand why the Primitive Christians knew nothing of the pomps and vanities of “vestments” for what is now erroneously termed the “Eucharistic sacrifice,” seeing that the *Lord’s Supper* in the Christian Church has taken the place of the *Passover* in the Jewish Church ; and we are taught in Scripture that the Passover itself was observed *without any prescribed vestments*, as the Divine command was—“Thus ye shall eat it ; with your loins girded, your shoes on your feet, and your staff in your hand.” (Exod. xii. 11.) Moreover, the Jewish sacrifice by God’s order at the Paschal feast was to be performed *without the intervention of any “priest” of the Levitical law* ; so that those Christians who contend for “the Eucharistic sacrifice,” and the duty of “adoring” the “Real Objective Presence,” are simply advocating a return to Jewish ordinances, and are guilty of that very sin of which Peter was guilty at Antioch, and for which Paul “withstood him to the face because he was to be blamed.” (Gal. ii. 11.) Thus our Lord

specimen of sacerdotal criticism, Mr. Marriott wrote to inform the editor that he had committed a slight mistake, for when completing the preparation of his *plates*, and not having by him any picture of an English clergyman of the present day, he sent into Windsor to obtain the first photograph to be had ; and received in return that of Canon Courtenay, Vicar of Bovey Tracey, who happened to be one of the most advanced Ritualists of the present day ! as we may judge from his teaching, which we have already pointed out, that “whenever the Holy Sacrifice is offered, Jesus is Himself present on the altars of His Church as God and man” !!!

instituted His Supper not in the Temple or in the Synagogue, but after the Passover, in "a large upper room," saying, "Do *this* in remembrance of me." The Primitive Christians readily obeyed their Master's command in private dwellings, "breaking bread from house to house." On the occasion of St. Paul's visit to Troas, "the disciples came together to break bread," *i.e.*, to partake of the Lord's Supper, or the evening Communion, "in the upper chamber" of the house where the Apostle preached to them "until midnight." But in all these instances not a trace of "vestments" is to be discovered. So that it betrays a lamentable ignorance of both Scripture and history on the part of our Ritualistic brethren, when they talk about the necessity of special vestments for the "Eucharistic sacrifice," in conformity with their so-called "Primitive and Catholic" custom. Seeing that the ecclesiastical vestments which the modern Church of Rome requires her priests to wear, and which the Ritualists have so faithfully copied, are admitted to be no more than the ordinary dresses of the ancient Romans, in the days of heathenism, it is something worse than a delusion to pretend that such vestments, heathen in their origin and lay in their use, could ever have been the symbols of divinely-revealed dogmas, or of mysteries of the Church of Christ. Happy would it be, if those who delight in such Babylonian garments, could only profit by an anecdote recorded by Walafridus Strabo, a divine of the ninth century, who relates that when Boniface, the German martyr, was asked if it were lawful to consecrate the sacraments in vessels of wood, replied, with just severity, "*Formerly golden priests used wooden cups, but now, on the contrary, wooden priests use golden cups.*"⁵

As, however, we have chiefly to consider what has been the law and practice of our Church since the Reformation, it may be well to note the variation in the "ornaments rubric" of the

⁵ Walafridus Strabo, cap. 24, *De Vasis et Vestibus Sacris*. Walafrid, a German by birth, and pupil of the celebrated Rabanus Maurus, was made Abbot of Rosenau, A.D. 842. The Martyr Boniface, whose words he quotes, was the same as Winifred, an Englishman, born at Crediton, near Exeter, A.D. 670.

different Prayer Books, as revised during the last three centuries by lawful authority.

In Edward the Sixth's *first* Prayer Book of 1549, there is no direction on the subject, the rubric reading :—

“The priest keeping in the quier shall begynne with a loude voyce the Lordes Prayer, called the *Pater Noster*.”

So that we may conclude the vestments in use at that date were those of the *unreformed* Church of England.

In his second Prayer Book of 1552, the ornaments rubric reads :—

“And here it is to be noted, that the minister *at the tyme of the Communion*, and at al other times in his ministracion, shall use neither albe, vestement, nor cope : but beyng archebishop, or bishop, he shal have and weare a rochet : and beyng a priest or deacon, he shal have and weare *a surples only*.”

In Queen Elizabeth's Prayer Book of 1559, the rubric is altered as follows :—

“And here it is to be noted, that the minister at the tyme of the Communion, and at all other tymes in hys ministracion, shall use suche ornamentes in the Church as wer in use by auctoritie of parliament in the second yere of the reygne of King Edward the VI., according to the Acte of Parliament set in the beginning of this booke.”

This Act of the first year of Elizabeth, entitled “Acte for the Uniformitie of Common Praier,” enacted—

“That such *ornaments* of the Churche and *of the ministers* thereof, shall be retained and be in use as was in the Churche of England, by auctorithy of Parliament, in the second yere of the raygne of K. Edward the VI. ; *until other order* shal be therein taken by the auctorithy of the Queen's Maiestie, with the advise of her Commissioners appointed and auctorized under the great seale of England, for causes ecclesiastical, or of the metropolitan of this realme.”

In accordance with this Act, Queen Elizabeth, in the seventh year of her reign, 1564, published certain *Advertisements, Partly for the due Order in the Publick Administration of the Holy Sacraments, and Partly for the Apparel of all Persons Ecclesiastical*, with the view as therein stated—

“To knit together in one perfect unity of doctrine, and to be conjoynd

in one uniformity of rites and manners in the ministration of God's Holy Word, in open prayer and *ministration of Sacraments*, as also to be of one decent behaviour in *their outward apparel*."

In these Advertisements the ministerial apparel is ordered as follows :—

"In the ministration of the Holy Communion in cathedral and collegiate churches, the principal minister shall wear a cope, with gospeller and epistoler agreeably, and at all other prayers to be said at that Communion table, to use no copes but surplices. . . . That every minister saying any public prayers, or ministering the Sacraments or other rites of the Church, shall wear *a comely surplice with sleeves*, to be provided at the charges of the parish; and that the parish provide a decent table, standing on a frame, for the Communion table."⁶

A diligent study of the *Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical*, "agreed upon by the Convocation of Canterbury, in their Synod begun at London A.D. 1603," will show that "surplices," "hoods," and "gowns with standing collars and sleeves," are the only articles of dress recognised by the Church as pertaining to the clergy; so that the cry raised by some in the present day for a "distinctive Eucharistic vestment" for the officiating minister at the Lord's Supper, was totally unknown in our Church at the beginning of the seventeenth century. It would be well if such persons attended to the hope expressed in the seventy-fourth canon, which treats of "Decency in Apparel enjoined to Ministers," and reads on this wise :—

"We, therefore, following the ancient custom of the Church of England, hope that in time *new-fangleness of apparel in some factious persons will die of itself*," &c.

Moreover, the language of the fifty-eighth canon is so precise, that to every well-balanced mind there can be no doubt as to the meaning of the Church's order respecting the dress of the officiating minister when engaged in the service of the sanctuary. It reads thus :—

"Every minister saying the public prayers, or ministering the sacraments, or other rites of the Church, shall wear *a decent and comely surplice with sleeves*, to be provided at the charge of the parish. . . . Such ministers as

⁶ Sparrow's *Collection of Articles*, &c., pp. 122—125.

are graduates shall wear upon their surplices, at such times, such *hoods* as by the orders of the Universities are agreeable to their degrees, which no minister shall wear (being no graduate) under pain of suspension."

In King James the First's book of 1604, the "ornaments rubric" is word for word the same as in that of 1559.

In King Charles the First's book of 1637 the rubric runs thus:—

"And here it is to be noted, that the presbyter or minister, at the time of the Communion, and at other times in his ministration, shall use such ornaments in the Church as are prescribed, or shall be by his Majestic or his successors, according to the Act of Parliament provided in that behalf."

In Charles the Second's book of 1662, which is the same as our present one, the "ornaments rubric" runs as follows:—

"And here it is to be noted, that such ornaments of the Church and the ministers thereof at all times of their ministration shall be retained and be in use, as were in this Church of England, by the authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI."

From a review of these various "ornaments rubrics," it would seem as if the interpretation of the present one, to be binding upon every clergyman of the Church of England, depends upon the authority of Parliament of the second year of King Edward, which is explained by the Act of the 1st of Elizabeth, authorising her to issue "Injunctions" on the subject, which she did, as we have already seen, in the seventh year of her reign; and which limits the vestment of the parish minister when officiating at the Holy Communion, or at any other time, to "*a comely surplice with sleeves*." And this accords with the judgments pronounced in the cases already referred to of *Martin v.*

⁷ Canon Swainson, in his *Brief Historical Enquiry*, asks, "What vestments and ornaments were in possession of the field when Charles' Act was passed? I know of none save the surplice and hood and tippet, and the bishop's habit. These were ordered to be retained. But the churches could not retain copes if they had not any. So far as parish churches were concerned, I believe that not a cope had been used from the year 1564 to this year 1662; ninety-eight years had passed since they were understood to be abolished: more than one hundred years, probably, since they were disused." (P. 53.)

Mackonochie, and *Hebbert v. Purchas*, by which various vestments in common use amongst our present Ritualists, such as “copes at morning or evening prayer; albs with patches, called apparels; tippets of a circular form; stoles of any kind whatsoever, whether black, white, or coloured, and worn in any manner; dalmatics at the Communion service; maniples worn by the minister; the chasuble at the Communion service; tunics or tunicles at the Communion service, and albs,” are pronounced illegal and forbidden.

It is known that at the *Savoy Conference*, A.D. 1661-2, at the time of the last revision of the Prayer Book, the Presbyterian or Puritan party objected that the “ornaments rubric,” as it was then settled, might possibly have the effect of restoring the “vestments” of the second year of King Edward VI., just as the Ritualists are now attempting to do; but in the answer then made by the bishops they at once denied all fear on that head, for they said that “*the surplice and the surplice only*” was the legal vestment for the officiating minister, as the law has ruled at the present time in the cases alluded to above.⁸

The “ornaments rubric” is used by the Ritualists in the present controversy with their usual tactics, as if it told exclusively in their favour; but when it is remembered that neither at the beginning of Elizabeth’s reign, when it was originally introduced into the Book of Common Prayer, nor at the Savoy Conference, when it was altered with an important modification, as we have just pointed out, that distinct “Eucharistic vest-

⁸ The use of the “surplice only” does not in any way set aside the use of the gown, when the minister is no longer performing any ministerial act, but is delivering his Master’s message in his own words, and not those of the Church. The origin of the black gown, as the distinctive dress of the preacher, may be traced back long before the Reformation, to the time when the Black Friars were sent into England by the Pope to preach, and to collect “Peter’s pence” for the supply of the Papal treasury. During the last three centuries the black gown has been the distinctive dress of the preacher; and hence the late Bishop Wilberforce, at a meeting of the Royal Commissioners, moved a resolution, which was carried unanimously, as may be seen in the Fourth Report, “That the surplice or gown, as now worn in preaching, be still used.”

ments" were not in use, we may conclude with the assurance of a Papal infallibilist, that our Ritualistic friends are in grave error respecting the true interpretation of this important rubric. The Dean of Chester well remarks, in his *Letter to a Layman*,—

"A rule is not commonly made for the express purpose of being broken. In the reign of Elizabeth, we have proof that the Eucharistic vestments were diligently sought out in order that they might be destroyed. At the Savoy Conference, this subject did not become the occasion of any controversy; and yet, in the early part of 1661, those earnest-minded men were within the Church of England who, on St. Bartholomew's Day in the following year, became the founders of Nonconformity. It is incredible that they who could not bear *the whip of the surplice*, should have been tolerant of *the scorpion of the chasuble*."

That the expressed opinion of the bishops at the Savoy Conference respecting the intention of our Reformers as to "the surplice only" being the proper Eucharistic vestment was correct, may be gathered from the fact that the object which Cranmer and his colleagues had at heart was a return, as far as practicable, to "Primitive and Catholic" usage. We have seen that in the Primitive Church there was no such thing known as a dress peculiar to the minister when engaged in any of the Church services, nor any distinction between the ordinary costume of the laity and clergy; much less any change of dress at the time of partaking of the Lord's Supper. And we have very decisive testimony from a very eminent father of the second century against the use of those very vestments which the Ritualists are now struggling so hard to force upon the Reformed Church of England. Clemens Alexandrinus thus speaks on the subject:—

"Coloured vestments are to be rejected, as they are the proof of a weak mind. For the use of colours is neither beneficial nor useful; nor has it anything for covering more than any other clothing, except the opprobrium alone. And the attraction of *coloured* vestments afflicts greedy eyes, inflaming them to senseless blindness. For those Christians who are most faithful to their calling, simple garments of a white colour are most suitable to them; as Daniel (vii. 9) and the Apocalypse (vi. 9, 11) alike declare that such was the garment of the Lord Himself, and of His martyrs. And if it were necessary to seek for any other colour, the natural colour of truth

should suffice. But *vestments, like coloured flowers, or variegated with gold and purple, and that piece of money, which has its name from the mark of the beast, are to be abandoned as suitable only to the tomfooleries of the priests of Bacchus.*"⁹

As a contrast to the teaching of the Primitive Church on the subject of "vestments," the *Directorium Anglicanum*, which is, I believe, a standard work with the Ritualists, describes "THE COPE" (the twenty-third specified vestment of an infinite number of costumes) as being made of "*scarlet cloth, lined with ermine, very rich with figures of saints, the whole vestment being covered with diaper work, fastened across the breast by a clasp called a morse*" !!! If such a vestment as this was "suitable only to the tomfooleries of the priests of Bacchus" in the second century, it would be equally suitable in the nineteenth century to a "priest" of that fallen Church who is described in Revelation as "*arrayed in purple and scarlet colour,*" and as "*drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus,*" and upon whose "*forehead a name was written, MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH.*" But no loyal minister of the Church of Christ would ever think of defiling himself by wearing such an unhallowed "Babylonish garment." The vestments worn by Roman priests at the *sacrifice of the mass* consist of five different colours, *white, red, green, purple, and black*, used at the various festivals of the Church of Rome, in which she so completely fulfils the merited condemnation which Clemens Alexandrinus passed upon "the tomfooleries of the priests of Bacchus;" and in which heathen practice she is so closely imitated by the Ritualistic clergy in the present day. With this primitive testimony against the use of such Bacchanalian vestments, it is difficult to understand how such a person as Dr. Pusey can have the confidence to assert, as he does in supporting the address of certain Ritualistic clergy at Oxford, who memorialized Convocation in favour of "Eucharistic vestments," notwithstanding the judicial condemnation passed upon

⁹ Clem. Alex., *Pædagog.*, lib. ii. cap. xi.

them by the Supreme Ordinary of the Church, that “the prohibition of the eastward position and the *vestments*, on the ground of doctrine reputed to be expressed by them, would be interpreted as *repudiating primitive doctrine* held and taught by the Church of England.”!!!

If we contrast the teaching of Clemens Alexandrinus in the second century with that of the Ritualistic doctors in the nineteenth, on the matter of “vestments” suitable to the Christian minister, we shall discern the amazing gulf which exists between the Primitive Christians and those who so fondly and vainly pretend to be their successors in the present day. It reminds us of the boast of the Pharisees under the old dispensation, “The Temple of the Lord are we;” which has been altered by their modern successors of the new dispensation into the well-known cry of “The Church, the Church are we”! But as the epigram justly puts it:—

A man may cry, Church! Church! at every word,
Without more piety than other people;
A daw's not reckoned a religious bird,
Because it keeps *caw-cawing* from the steeple!

In the early days of the Tractarian school, when advocating the duty of “more special decorations of churches on festival days—such as altar coverings of unusual richness; or the *natural flowers of the season*, woven into wreaths, or placed according to primitive (?) custom on the altar,” all of which have been adopted to a ludicrous extent by the Anglican Ultramontanes in the present day—a professed teacher of Christianity, in contending that these floral decorations “should be chosen with especial reference to the subject of the festival,” proceeds with infinite gravity to say:—

“*White flowers* are most proper on the days consecrated to the Virgin, as emblematic of *sinless purity*; *purple* or *crimson* upon the several saints' days, (*except* St. John, and *perhaps* St. Luke,) to signify the blood of martyrdom. . . . We deprecate *forced flowers*, which look artificial; but we believe that, *with a little management*, natural flowers of the proper colours may be found throughout the year. *It is difficult to conceive* a more

suitable occupation for the Christian population than that of cultivating flowers for such a purpose, and afterwards arranging them"!!!¹

Although the religion of this doctor has a tendency to combine piety with market gardening, it is very difficult, to use his own language, to conceive anything more puerile than this miserable travestie of the Christian religion, and which, alas! appears so very congenial to those who are content with the form of godliness without knowing the power thereof. This was made strikingly manifest by an ultra-Ritualist thinking it right, when adorning his church for harvest festival, to place a *boar's head* on the Lord's table, surrounded by a garland of flowers!!!

Tertullian in his work, *On the Ascetic's Mantle*, *passim*; and in another work, *On Female Dress*, chapters viii., ix., and x., which contain an account of the *origin* of all these vestments and ornaments, and which appear to charm those minds, whether male or female, who sink their religion in the pomps and vanities of worldly splendour—as also Cyprian, in his *Treatise on the Dress of Virgins*, have some valuable remarks on the subject, which those who seem to regard the adoption of such ornaments to be of vital importance, would do well to take heed. For the “vestments,” of which we hear so much in the present day, cannot boast of any very dignified descent or origin. “The alb” and “tunicle” are nothing more or less than the shirt which the ancient Romans were wont to wear, originally without sleeves, although afterwards adopted as a luxury by the wealthy heathen. Livy (lib. i. 20) tells us that Numa appointed 12 priests for Mars, and distinguished them with embroidered tunics or shirts, which is the earliest mention of such garments in connection with pagan priests. Next we have the “dalmatic,” a kind of undress toga, introduced from Dalmatia (whence its name) and worn out of doors, by the Emperor Heliogabalus, so infamous for his gluttony and other vices, to the grave scandal of his subjects. When the material of the “pænula” became stiff with rich embroidery, the sides

¹ *British Critic*, No. 64, p. 277.

were cut away to give room for the arms, and it thus became the "chasuble," derived from the Latin *casula*, which means "a little cottage." Columella, a great authority on such matters, says that "casula is a garment with a hood, and means 'a little cottage,' because it covers the whole man." In reality it was an overcoat for the Roman peasant in bad weather, which he pleasantly termed his *chasuble*, or little cottage. The "cope" was the *pluviale* to turn off the rain, which originally had a hood; but the embroidery caused its dismissal. The "stole," or "*orarium*" as it is sometimes termed, was originally a strip of linen to wipe the face, as our modern pocket-handkerchief performs the office in the present day. Such is the parentage of these "vestments," for which some of our clergy are so vigorously contending; though we are at a loss to imagine how old clothes of pagan origin can be in any way *symbolical*, as it is commonly said, of the grand truths of the Christian religion.²

Now we know how certain clergy in the present day show their adherence to "Primitive and Catholic" usage, on the question of coloured vestments, when engaged in the service of the sanctuary. I select the testimony of two persons, who say they have seen with their own eyes what is now the custom of two London churches, and assert with confidence that such is the general practice in those churches of an advanced type. *Ex uno disce omnes.*

A correspondent of the *Daily Telegraph*, Nov. 1, 1872, thus writes:—

² Jerome is supposed to be the earliest writer who speaks of any peculiar dress as pertaining to the clergy of his time, (the close of the fourth century,) and he limits it to those "white linen garments," which are spoken of in Rev. xix. 8, 14, which constitute "the righteousness of saints," and which are alone authorized by the Church of England. In his treatise against the Pelagians, he says:—"You say that all splendour of dress or ornament is offensive to God; but I would like to know what offence there would be against God, if, in the administration of holy things, bishop, priest, and deacon, and the other officers of the Church, come forward dressed in white garments." (*Adversus Pelagianos*, lib. i., vol. iv. p. 502.)

"A few minutes before 8 p.m. I was in *All Saints*', (Lambeth,) the church of Dr. Lee. Above the wooden screen of the chancel I noticed a *crucifix*, and on the altar a gilt cross with six lighted candles. The congregation rose when a procession entered, headed by a cross-bearer, attended by two youths bearing lighted candles, and clad in *scarlet* cassocks, with short white over-tunics and *scarlet caps*. The dresses of the rest varied. One wore a large *plum-coloured* cloak and hood; another wore a cloak covered with *blue* embroidery. Dr. Lee wore a white satin cope, with a large cross, splendidly worked in *various colours*, on the back. While the 'Magnificat' was sung the censer was lighted, and Dr. Lee *censed the cross on the altar*, and then all the ornaments, and then handed the censer to an assistant with a *blue* cape over his surplice, who then *censed* Dr. Lee, and afterwards all the persons in the chancel. Dr. Lee delivered a short discourse, in which he said that *the faithful departed were not yet in the presence of God*," &c.³

A bishop's examining chaplain writes to the *Record*, April 25, 1874, as follows:—

"I was walking past All Saints', Margaret-street, (Mr. Berdmore Compton's church,) this morning, about 11.30, when I thought I would step in and see the inside of the building, which I had never done before. I did so, and found divine service going on. But, as soon as I entered, I could hardly believe that it was in a church belonging to the Church of England. The Communion Service, or rather 'Mass,' was being performed. There were three officiating 'priests,' all of whom, throughout, kept their backs turned upon the congregation, with their faces toward the 'altar.' They were apparelled in *red robes, with various embroideries*. The one in the middle, the 'celebrant,' had a large cross worked in his robe, from his neck downwards. *Two lofty candles were burning at mid-day*. The 'celebrant' raised the elements above his head, while the pauses, the genuflexions, and

³ The *Church Review* gives an account of the Rector of St. Olive's, Exeter, publicly accepting a set of "Eucharistic vestments," which had been presented by some admirer of Pagan antiquity. After a glowing notice of the way in which the Romanizing rector "placed them on the altar, and unfolded each article separately," the account goes on to state, that he "proceeded to use the Benediction Offices in the *Priests' Prayer Book* for the Benediction of Vestments, mentioning chasuble, alb, maniple," &c. Passing by the profane folly of which this rector was thus guilty, we should be glad to know how he can reconcile the introduction of an unauthorized service book, with those solemn vows which every clergyman takes, to use in the public service of the Church of England only the Book of Common Prayer, "*and none other!*"

other postures and bowings, were such as to render our Church of England service almost unintelligible. . . . The raising of the cup, and other absurd and elaborate performances after the 'Mass' was over, in addition to what had gone before, clearly prove that the 'idolatry of the Mass' has been actually introduced into the Church of England."

It would be well if these clergy remembered the stern condemnation, which a distinguished Englishman, twelve centuries ago, passed upon such fripperies of ecclesiastical millinery, when an attempt was made to introduce similar vestments into the service of the English Church. Winifred of Crediton, subsequently known by the name of Boniface, when sent as missionary to Germany in the beginning of the eighth century, in a letter addressed to Cuthbert, Archbishop of Canterbury, very severely condemns the increasing luxury in dress and ornament which characterized the English clergy of his time, speaks of the "vestments" as having *been brought into England by Antichrist*, and as the precursors of his advent, and declares that he "detested the arrogance, the pride, the depraved life, and the double-tongueness," which they engendered.⁴

Can we, with such facts staring us in the face, deny that our Ritualistic clergy of the present day are guilty, not merely of disobedience to the pronounced law of the Church of which they are sworn members, but have laid themselves open to the very serious charge of imitating, to use the strong language of that eminent primitive teacher, Clemens Alexandrinus, "*the tomfooleries of the priests of Bacchus?*" But, inasmuch as some have endeavoured to justify their action in this matter on Scriptural grounds, it may be well to notice what the only infallible authority which the Church of Christ has ever possessed teaches on the subject. It is known to all that the Jewish Church possessed a gorgeous ritual, splendid vestments, altars, sacrifices, mid-day lights, incense, &c., &c., but *all ordered specially by God's command*, and therefore binding upon the faithful. It appears from St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, that when certain "false brethren, who were unawares brought

⁴ Boniface's *Letter to Cuthbert* is given by Spelman, *Concil.*, p. 214.

in" to the "Churches of Galatia," sought to return to the ancient Jewish ritual, upon the same plea, we conclude, which is so much dwelt upon at the present time, of "Primitive and Catholic usage," St. Paul expressly declares that to such false brethren he "gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour; that the truth of the Gospel might continue with you." And when some of the weaker brethren, like Peter and Barnabas, had been nearly "carried away with such dissimulation," the stronger and more faithful Apostle declares, "When Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, *because he was to be blamed*,"—as indeed are all they who seek to set their own will above that of God or man. But does Scripture teach us anything respecting the use of gorgeous vestments in the service of Him who is a Spirit, and who requires His people to worship Him in spirit and in truth? The only reference to such things, as in any way pertaining to public service, is to be found in 2 Kings x., where we have an account of Jehu's contest with the prophets of Baal, as it is written:—

"And Jehu said, Proclaim a solemn assembly for Baal. And they proclaimed it. And Jehu sent through all Israel; and all the worshippers of Baal came; and the house of Baal was full from one end to another. And he said unto him that was over the vestry, Bring forth *vestments for all the worshippers of Baal*. And he brought them forth vestments." (ver. 20—22.)

From what has been already shown, both from Scripture and a high authority in the Primitive Church, it would appear that the only parties entitled to the prescriptive right of wearing "vestments" when professing to serve their respective deities, were "*the worshippers of Baal*," during the old dispensation, and "*the priests of Bacchus*," under the new. It may, therefore, well excite alarm in the minds of Protestant Churchmen, to find that one of the first subjects discussed by the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury, after the reception of the Queen's Letter authorizing it to consider a Revision of the Rubrics, was a proposal to legalize the use of those vestments which the Archbishop of Canterbury ominously remarked were "*associated in the minds of the whole people of*

England with the Mass, and not with the Communion Service of the Church of England." The Episcopal Bench appear to be divided on this momentous question. The Bishops of Lincoln, Salisbury, Lichfield, and Peterborough, favoured the use of these "vestments," which we have seen were so abhorrent to the mind of the Primitive Church. The Bishops of Winchester and Oxford appear to have been in favour of a *via media* course, the latter, in strange forgetfulness of the action of the Ritualists during the last few years, arguing that those who asked for the change were "men free from eccentricities, and the types of what English clergymen ought to be."!!! The Primate, in opposing this very dangerous proposal, was supported by three of his suffragans, viz., the Bishops of Bath and Wells, Gloucester, and London. The last of these very properly pointed out, that while the result of the insidious proposal "would be to legalize vestments at present pronounced to be illegal," it was "not the business of a body of reverend and grave divines to act the part of ecclesiastical tailors, and devise vestments, however proper." The Bishop of London added, with much justice, that "if, as they were told, there were 4000 clergymen who desired the use of these vestments, there were 22,000 clergymen of the Church of England," implying that four-fifths were against their use. But I believe the rumour, to which the bishop alluded, is, like most other rumours, greatly exaggerated. I do not believe that half that number⁵ could be found amongst the clergy, who would willingly adopt the Babylonian garment, which is, according to Scripture, one

⁵ I believe the exact numbers of those clergy who have petitioned *for* and *against* the two points of the "eastward position," and a distinctive Eucharistic dress, to be as follows:—rather more than 1400 *for*; and 5300 *against*. Nevertheless, a Ritualist in the *Church Review* of Jan. 30th, 1875, has the surprising hardihood to express his wonder that no more than 5300 signatures were obtained against legalizing such things, as in his estimation they are of no value whatever; while as regards his own side, he confidently declares, "If only 1000 have signed the contrary petition, it will be no mean testimony as to what is in reality the *living* mind of the Church of England."!!!

of the characteristic marks of Antichrist,⁶ when engaged in the worship of Him who is a Spirit, and who requires of His worshippers reasonable service; for it is surely most unreasonable to see ministers of Christ, who reject what our Prime Minister has justly termed, "the mass in masquerade," arrayed in fantastic dresses of all colours of the rainbow, which are suitable, as Clemens Alexandrinus says, "only to the priests of Bacchus."

It is melancholy, however, to see that those whom the Bishop of London delights to honour, take so different a view from their diocesan on this momentous question. When the notorious *All Saints'*, Margaret-street, was vacant about two years ago, certain of the faithful parishioners took the unusual step of petitioning the bishop not to appoint any but an honest Protestant pastor to the church. He, however, felt it his duty to reject the petition by nominating the Rev. Berdmore Compton, who, as we have already pointed out on the authority of a "Bishop's Chaplain," is doing his utmost, by the aid of these "Bacchanalian" vestments, useless "lights," and other heathen accessories, to turn "the Communion Service" of the Church of England into "the Mass" of the Church of Rome; for which

⁶ The description of the Babylonian garments, as worn by the followers of "the great whore that sitteth upon many waters, with whom the kings of the earth have committed fornication," is thus given in the infallible words of Scripture:—"The woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet colour, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations." (Rev. xvii. 1-4.) The newspapers have recently described a scene at the Roman "pro-cathedral" in London, wherein Dr. Manning, the chief agent in this country of the "man of sin," is described as being "vested in a magnificent cope of dark velvet purple, with a mitre on his head, addressing the congregation from the words, 'His eyes have seen the King in His beauty,'" and applying them to "His Holiness the Pope," whom he profanely affirmed to be "shut up in his palace a prisoner, though there were some men too wicked to admit this'"!!! Surely this must be another instance of what Mr. Gladstone has appropriately termed Dr. Manning's "usual hardihood;" for he is evidently one of those who, like his prototype Loyola, can readily believe "black to be white, if the Roman Church so define it to be."

they were thus "sharply rebuked" by the late Archbishop Longley, in his posthumous charge of 1867:—

"There are ministers of our Church who think themselves at liberty to hold the doctrines of the Church of Rome, in relation to *the sacrifice of the Mass*, and yet retain their position within the pale of the Anglican Church, with the avowed purpose of eliminating from its formularies *every trace of the Reformation*, as regards its protest against Romish error; the language which they hold with respect to it being entirely incompatible with loyalty to the Church to which they profess to belong. *They remain with us in order that they may substitute the Mass for the Communion; the obvious aim of our Reformers having been to substitute the Communion for the Mass.*"

When we remember that the same high authority, when Bishop of Ripon, had in 1851 published a Letter to the Parishioners of Leeds, stating that he had ample evidence of many of his clergy holding all the heresies and un-Catholic doctrines of the Church of Rome, and that in the previous year the disloyal clergy had "issued an invitation to *yield submission to the Pope*, we can the more readily understand the meaning of that subtle controversialist, M. Capel, who obtained such a signal victory over his semi-Ritualist opponent, Canon Liddon, in the controversy which occupied so many columns of *The Times* at the beginning of 1875, in speaking of "the organized dishonesty of Ritualism, and its deleterious influence on English family life," as well as the testimony which he bears to the fact that there is no real difference between the teaching of the Ritualists and that of the Church of Rome.

"The practical results," wrote M. Capel in reply to Canon Liddon, Jan. 22, 1875, "of such prayers (those found in the *Vade-Mecum*,) is to imbue the minds of Ritualists with *our* doctrines of the Real Presence and Transubstantiation. While this discussion has been going on, I have made it a point to ask many of the converts from Ritualism, whether they are conscious of any difference between *their present and their former faith on this doctrine*. The invariable answer has been, '*Not the least; I only perceive more clearly what is meant.*' I need not say more."

To which we may add, further comment is quite needless to any one who can distinguish between truth and error, or darkness and light.

In confirmation of our view, that the so-called "Eucharistic vestments" have no *locus standi* in the Reformed Church of England, we may adduce the testimony of the Ritual Commission of 1867, which, as is well known, was formed under the skilful manipulation of the late Bishop Wilberforce,⁷ and therefore, of necessity, as a body with anti-Evangelical leanings, yet they were constrained by the weight of evidence to declare against these anti-Christian and un-Catholic garments as pertaining to the minister of Christ when engaged in public service. The following extract, which is taken from one of their reports, addressed "To the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty," dated August 19th, 1867, will speak for itself:—

"We, your Majesty's Commissioners, have in accordance with the terms of your Majesty's Commission, directed our first attention to the question of the vestments worn by ministers at the time of their ministrations, and especially to those the use of which has been lately introduced into certain churches. We find that while *these vestments* are regarded by some witnesses as *symbolical of doctrine*, and by others as a distinctive vesture, whereby they desire to do honour to the Holy Communion as the highest act of Christian worship, *they are by none regarded as essential, and they give grave offence to many.* We are of opinion, that it is expedient to *restrain* in the public service of the Church all variations in respect of vesture from that which has long been the established usage of the Church."

Considering that this report was signed by upwards of twenty-eight Royal Commissioners, amongst whom were the names of such pronounced Ritualists as Lord Beauchamp, Mr. Beresford Hope, Sir Robert Phillimore, amongst the laity, with Canon Gregory and the Rev. T. W. Perry amongst the clergy, we may judge how strong must be the evidence against the legality

⁷ Notwithstanding Bishop Wilberforce's strong Ritualistic proclivities in general, once, when he and the Archbishop of York thought it well to preach the Gospel in a Presbyterian Church in Scotland, the chief organ of the Ritualistic press, the *Church Times*, defined the Apostolic prohibition against speaking evil of dignitaries by the following Christian sentiment:—"We see no chance for Dr. Wilberforce, unless he should have a touch of softening of the brain, whereby his sense of his own cleverness might suffer complete paralysis."

of these "Eucharistic vestments," which our Ritualistic brethren are making such unheard-of efforts to possess, and which the Ultras seem determined to retain, notwithstanding their merited condemnation by the laws of God and man.

It may be useful, in drawing this chapter to a close, to mention that Mr. Hotten, of Piccadilly, has recently published a work from MS. documents preserved among the miscellaneous papers in the Episcopal Registry at Lincoln, which prove beyond all question how the so-called "Eucharistic vestments" were rejected by the Church of England at the Reformation. In the eighth year of Elizabeth a Royal Commission was issued to the churchwardens of 150 parishes in the county of Lincoln, the object of which was to procure returns of such articles of church ornaments as had been used in the reign of "bloody Mary," but which in the year 1566 were considered superstitious, as contrary to the principles and practice of the Primitive Church. To give one or two extracts from this work, we find in page 72 the following admission:—

"Itm. Two old *vestmentes* and old cope, one crosse, two candlesticks, one pare of sensures, and one hollie water fatte, *with all other monumentes of supersticion*. . . . were torne and made awaie in the third yere of the Quene's Majestie that now is, by William Watkinson and Johnne Bentley, then churche wardens of the said Churche of Durhame."

"Dunsbie.—Itm. iij. *vestmentes*, two albes, one crosse clothe of canvis, two stoles, and one vale—sold to Willm. Sknave, one of the churchwardens of this present tyme, and he haith defaced and torne them in peces, and hathe made hangings for beddes and painted cloth ther of."

On every page of this volume, consisting of nearly 300 pages, we have frequent entries of "silk banners, lights, crucifixes, vestments stiff with jewels, sacring bells, censers," &c., &c., which were in use previous to the reign of Elizabeth, of which the Reformation made a clean sweep, and which some amongst us are so ignorantly craving for; just as the Israelites in the wilderness lusted after the idolatrous practices of the Egyptians. These lists of the "monuments of superstition," at a time when England was in bondage to Rome, prove the extent to which the pure truth of the Gospel had been degraded. And it is to

this system of Paganized Christianity that our modern Ritualists, in their blindness and ignorance of all that is true, and noble, and spiritual, and holy in the Church of Christ, would force the people to accept, if they had the power. The drift of the Oxford movement, or as it is called by some "the Catholic revival," upon the principle we suppose of *Lucus a non Lucendo*, is to take us back to the childish baubles and foolish mummeries of the dark ages, when a corrupt and designing priesthood lorded it over an ignorant and superstitious people. Instead of the spiritual teaching of the Book of Common Prayer, which the pious Nonconformist, Robert Hall, so well defined in the memorable sentence, "The Evangelical purity of its sentiments, the chastised fervour of its devotions, and the majestic simplicity of its language, have combined to place it in the very first rank of uninspired compositions,"—in place of the life-giving power of Holy Scripture, the only infallible authority which God has been pleased to give to man, we are asked to substitute the meretricious vestments of the lady of the seven hills, the absurd and ludicrous legends of the Mediæval "Saints," the veneration of relics, priestly rule, and all the degrading ritual of the apostate Church of Rome.⁸

⁸ The following reason is given by Gury, a distinguished German Jesuit and Professor of Morals, in his *Casus Conscientiæ*, as a justification for the Roman missionaries in China adopting the symbols and *vestments* of the Pagans, in order to induce them to turn Papists: "If they should be the vestments and symbols of the religion of the heathen, they may be lawfully worn by the missionaries, supposing the *vestments* are not exclusively distinctive, for then their *primary* use would be to cover the body, and their *secondary* use to distinguish the sect." (Vol. i. 124.) This will fully explain the action of the Church of Rome in past ages, and the craving of our Ritualistic sect after these Babylonian garments in the present day.

CHAPTER X.

LIGHTS.

THE practice of using lights in the public worship of God, when not needed for the purpose of affording light to the worshippers, is another of those many senseless customs which later Christians have adopted from the heathen. It is scarcely necessary to observe, that the Primitive Christians knew nothing of such a practice; and it shows a lamentable instance of a perverted mind to argue that because lamps or candles are required for use *at night*, therefore it is allowable to have them for ornament and for the honour of God *during the day*! A layman, who does not appear to be very well acquainted with the subject on which he writes, contends that because "the use of lights most certainly formed part of the original institution of the Lord's Supper,"⁸ which took place *at night*, therefore it is necessary to have them by *day*!!! Other Ritualists contend for them, because in the record of the Holy Communion at Trois it is said "there were *many lights* in the upper chamber where the disciples were gathered together," (Acts xx. 8;) but as in both these instances we have proof of the Primitive Christians partaking of the "evening Communion," it only shows that the lights thus mentioned were for use and not for ornament.

The earliest sign of lights by daytime appears towards the close of the fourth century, that age when so many heathen customs had been engrafted into the service of the Christian Church. Jerome seems to intimate that in his time they were lighted by day as well as night; and that was evidently an innovation upon the previous practice, which was only of neces-

⁸ *Lights Before the Sacrament*, by J. D. Chambers, Recorder of New Sarum, p. 13.

sity when Christians were forced to meet in the darkness of night, or in their underground assemblies, when of course lights were required for use. Nor does Jerome say that there was any order of the Church, or any general custom to authorize it; but only that it was tolerated in some places "*to satisfy the ignorance, and weakness, and simplicity of some of the worldly-minded men.*"⁹ But it is certain that a century before the time of Jerome, both from the deserved ridicule which a great Christian authority pours out on such a senseless custom, and also from the express prohibition which one of the early Councils made on the subject, the Primitive Christians knew nothing of such malpractices; for the Council of Eliberis (A.D. 305) decreed as follows: "*Let no one presume to set up lights in the daytime in any cemetery or church.*" (Canon 34.) And Lactantius, "the Christian Cicero," as he was justly termed, thus speaks of heathen customs in the worship of their false gods:—

"The heathen sacrifice victims to God as though He were hungry; they pour wine to Him as though He were thirsty; *they kindle lights to Him as though He were in darkness.* If they would but contemplate that heavenly light which we Christians call 'the sun,' they would at once see that *God has no need of their candles*, who has Himself given so clear and bright a light for the use of man. Is he not therefore *a madman* who presents the light of candles or lamps as an offering to Him who is the author and giver of light? The same sort of blindness everywhere oppresses these miserable heathen; for as they know not who is the true God, so they know not what constitutes true worship."¹

When, therefore, we find a Ritualist arguing in favour of *lights* in mid-day, for ornament and not for use, because, as he says,—

"King Edgar's canons enact that '*Lights should be always burning in the church when mass is singing;*' and by the constitution of Giles de

⁹ Jerome, *Contr. Vigilant.*, t. ii. p. 123.

¹ Lactantius, *The Divine Institutes*, lib. vi. ch. 1 and 2. Lactantius is, I believe, the only writer of the first three centuries who speaks on the matter, for the very sufficient reason that the Christians of those early ages knew nothing whatever of "*lights*" in public worship, save when required for use.

Bridport, Bishop of Salisbury, 1236, the parson was to provide the candlestick and the parishioners the candles at 'matins, vespers, and the mass throughout the year, as well as blest bread with candles in every church' "2—

it only proves the vast gulf between the doctrines of the Mediæval Church and those held and taught by Christians of the primitive age.

The law of the Church of England since the Reformation has been fully set forth in the judgment of the well-known case of *Martin v. Mackonochie*, in which the judges ruled as follows:—

"The lighted candles are clearly not 'ornaments' within the words of the rubric, for they are not prescribed by the authority of Parliament therein mentioned, viz., the first Prayer Book; nor is the injunction of 1547 the authority of Parliament with the meaning of the rubric. They are not subsidiary to the service, for they do not aid or facilitate—much less are they necessary to—the service.

"The rubric, speaking in 1661, more than one hundred years subsequently, has for reasons defined the class of ornaments to be retained by a reference, not to what was in use *de facto*, or to what was lawful in 1549, but to what was in the Church by authority of Parliament in that year, and in the Parliamentary authority, which this committee has held, and which their lordships hold to be indicated by these words, the ornaments in question are not found to be included.

"Their lordships are of opinion that the very general disuse of lights after the Reformation, *contrasted with their normal and prescribed use previously*, affords a very strong contemporaneous and continuous exposition of the law upon the subject.

"Their lordships will, therefore, humbly advise Her Majesty that the charges as to *lights* has been sustained, and that the respondent (*Mackonochie*) should be admonished for the future to abstain from the use of them." 3

Although the Ritualists have generally shown a determination

* Chambers' *Lights Before the Sacrament*, p. 35. It is curious to see what lengths some men will go in support of an untenable theory; but it is difficult to suppose that this writer can have seriously investigated the practice of the Primitive Christians when he declares that "the usage of lights is scriptural, ordained by Christ Himself, Apostolic, Primitive, Catholic, and that it has, by the common consent of all Christendom, been observed at the time of the celebration of the Lord's Supper."!!! (Page 39.)

³ *Privy Council Appeal Cases*, 1867—9, p. 392. Law Reports.

to disobey the law of the Church on this as on many other points, when it conflicts with what they conceive to be a higher authority, viz., their ideal but mistaken private judgment of what the "Primitive and Catholic" Church held and taught on the subject, it is a remarkable fact, that when the *English Church Union* submitted a case on this very point to the judgment of certain lawyers, the answer given by such distinguished authorities as the late Sir William Bovill and the present Lord Coleridge was that lighted candles at the Communion service were "NOT LAWFUL" in the Reformed Church of England.

Nevertheless, at a meeting held in London by the Ritualists after the judgment in the Mackonochie case, and attended by about fifty clergymen, who were then in the habit of burning what they term "altar-lights" in their respective churches, the following resolution was agreed to *nem. con.* :—

"That this meeting deems it advisable to *continue the use of altar lights*, leaving to those in authority to interfere or not, as they may think fit."

I find a correspondent of the *Church Review*, under the signature of "Village Parson," writing at the same time in the following strain :—

"I hold that the first six General Councils, and the rite of the whole *Catholic Church*, as to *lights and incense*, to be quite sufficiently paramount for our guidance; and woe be to those lawyers who would *abolish the sign of our Lord's divinity!* Surely if the Queen *endorses* their 'opinions' she will *forfeit her title* of 'nursing mother' of the Church of England, which is *Catholic*. And whoever would divest her of her *Catholicity* sets up a *new and unscriptural Church!*"

Seeing that the Queen did "endorse" the opinions of the Judicial Committee respecting "*lights and incense*" in the Mackonochie case, thereby constituting it both the law of the Church and the land, which it was not before, it is to be regretted that "Village Parson" should expose himself, whether it be in his interpretation of the term "Catholic," or of the obligation of an oath in respect to the obedience due to the Supreme Ordinary of the Church, in the way he has done.

There, is, however, great reason to fear that the Ritualists have been much encouraged in their determination to disobey

the powers that be, which Scripture clearly shows to be one of the characteristic marks of the predicted apostasy, by the behaviour of the bishops generally towards the parties which now divide our Church into two camps of irreconcilable hostility. With the exception of two or three instances of bishops coming nobly forward in defence of the great principles of the Reformation, they have as a body displayed a painful reluctance to condemn those who merit it so much, notwithstanding the unbridled license of language with which they have been assailed by the organs of the Ritualistic press. When we find the bishops generally expressing such anxiety that the rubrics should be closely adhered to; and more severely censuring those who do not punctiliously keep the letter of the law, or “cleanse the outside of the cup and the platter,” in the way which our modern Pharisees are so fond of doing, they remind us of the charge of the late Bishop Blomfield, who, when in the diocese of London, expressed a wish that all his clergy should preach in *white*, while, when Bishop of Chester, he had enjoined his clergy there to preach in *black*; and who proved himself a master of illogical reasoning by affirming that there was “no harm” in two wax candles on the Lord’s table, provided that they be “*not lighted*.” !!!

CHAPTER XI.

INCENSE.

THE same arguments which prove the illegality of LIGHTS, unless required for the purpose of giving light, in Christian worship, tell against the use of INCENSE on similar occasions. Holy Scripture shows that while it was commanded by God to the obedient Jewish priests under certain prescribed rules, to all else who attempted to offer "strange incense," whether Jews or Gentiles, the awful penalty was *death*. Hence the stern language of the inspired prophet against the rebellious children of Israel, and which is peculiarly applicable to the sacerdotal party, whether belonging to the Churches of England or Rome, in the present day :—

"To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? saith the Lord. . . . Bring no more vain oblations; *incense* is an abomination unto me; it is iniquity, even the solemn meeting." (Isa. i. 11—13.)

Incense was totally unknown to the Primitive Church; it has been authoritatively forbidden in our Reformed Church; and, consequently, those Ritualists, who disregard their vows of obedience, like as we have seen Dr. Lee and others of his school, who place their own unauthorized judgment above the law, adopt it, continue it, and glorify in making themselves a scandal and reproach to all who love the apostolic principle of obedience to the powers that be. The Ritualists have shown but small practical regard to this principle which they profess as a prime article of their faith. It is true that the early founders of this sect discontinued the *Tracts for the Times* at the wish of the then Bishop of Oxford; but they have propagated the doctrines contained in those *Tracts* with undiminished zeal; and the famous Tract No. XC., that singular monument of logical petteffogging, which has been justly described as the "Art of Perjury

made Easy," has been openly adopted and defended by Dr. Pusey, in his message of peace to the Church of Rome.⁴ Such is the mode of procedure respecting obedience on the part of those who make such high pretensions to regulate their worship according to the pattern of the "Primitive and Catholic" Church.

The first thing that strikes a Protestant on entering a place of worship belonging either to the Church of Rome or to an advanced Ritualistic congregation, must be a perceptible sense of the use of incense or perfumes in the religious ceremonies practised therein.

This custom is directly derived from the Pagans of old, as Virgil, in his description of the Paphian Venus, speaks of

" Her hundred altars with garlands crown'd,
And richest *incense* smoking, breathe around
Sweet odours," &c.—*Aeneid*, i. 577.

In the descriptions of the heathen temples and altars, they are scarcely ever mentioned without the epithets *perfumed* or *incensed*. Under the Pagan emperors, the use of *incense* for any religious service was considered so contrary to the obligations of Christianity, that in their persecutions the method of testing and convicting a Christian, was by requiring him only to throw the least grain of it on the altar or into the censer. While under the Christian emperors of the fourth century, the use of *incense* was regarded as a rite so peculiarly heathenish, that the very places or houses where it could be proved to have been employed were, by a law of Theodosius, (A.D. 378—395,) confiscated to the government. In the ancient sculptures, whenever heathen sacrifices are represented, a lad in a white garment is always represented as waiting on the priest, with a box in his hands, in which the *incense* was kept for the use of the altar; just as in the Church of Rome a boy is employed, clad in a surplice, waiting on the priest at the altar, with the *thuribulum*, or vessel of incense, which the priest, whether

⁴ Dr. Pusey's *Eirenicon*, pp. 30, 31.

Roman or Ritualist, with many crossings and other bodily movements, waves several times, as it is smoking around, in different parts of the service.

Now let us hear what the Primitive Christians thought and taught respecting the use of incense and its concomitants in their religious services.

(1.) Clemens Alexandrinus, in the second century, thus writes:—

“The altar with us Christians is the congregation of those who devote themselves to prayers, having as it were one common voice and one mind. . . . Now breathing out our prayers together is properly said of the Church. Hence the sacrifice of the Church is the word breathing *as incense* from holy souls, the sacrifice and the whole mind being at the same time unveiled before God. . . . Wherefore we ought to offer to God sacrifices not costly, but such as He loves. And that compounded *incense* figuratively mentioned in the law is that which consists of many tongues and voices in prayer, or rather of different nations brought together in the unity of the faith.”⁵

(2.) Athenagoras, the contemporary of Clement, and probably the ablest of all the early apologists, gives the following reasons why Christians neither sacrificed nor used *incense* in their religious services:—

“Most of those who charge us with atheism, because they have not the most dreamy conception of what God really is, and are all utterly unacquainted with spiritual truth, are such as measure religion by a system of sacrifice. Now in reply to this grievous error respecting sacrifice, the Creator of this universe does not need blood, nor the odour of burnt offerings, nor the fragrance of flowers and *incense*, forasmuch as He Himself is perfect fragrance, needing nothing either within or without; but the noblest sacrifice, and the most acceptable to God, is for us to know Him who made the heavens and the earth. What has the Christian to do with burnt offerings, or sacrifices, or incense, which God does not require? though He does require us to ‘present our bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto Him, which is our reasonable service.’ ”⁶

The argument which Athenagoras here uses against the reproaches of the heathen, who unjustly charged the Christians

⁵ Clem. Alex., *Stromata* or *The Miscellanies*, lib. vii. c. 6.

⁶ Athenagoras' *Apology for the Christians*, ch. xiii.

with godlessness, because they did not worship their deities as the Pagans did, remind us of the "hard speeches" which certain brethren are in the habit of using against those Protestants who differ from them on the whole economy of Gospel truth. *E.g.*, the *Church News*, of May 5th, 1869, speaking of the Evangelical clergy, says:—

"They carry on schools, and are indefatigable in visiting the poor, and infusing into the veins of an ignorant and unsuspecting populace *the poison of Protestant heresy*."

The *Church Times*, of Sept. 3rd, 1869, writes in a similar strain, observing:—

"We should much prefer seeing attention centered on theological matters and questions of discipline, and extirpating that *ulcerous cancer of Protestantism*, which must be fatal, sooner or later, to any Church that does not use moral steel and fire upon it."

Dean Cowie, of Manchester, is reported to have preached a sermon at St. John's, Hulme, June 20th, 1874, in which he defined *the religion of Protestants* as more suitable to the "pot-house" than to a church, and condemned it as "the vulgar, blatant, ignorant Protestantism of newspaper writers and platform speakers."⁷ We have no thought or wish to retort such "revilings," remembering the example of the Primitive Christians; but we must lament that Dean Cowie does not view Evangelical men and Evangelical truth in the same way as Dr. Pusey and Canon Liddon have done. In the church where this sermon was preached, the congregation was shortly after

⁷ It is quite evident that the object of the Oxford movement from the beginning (nearly half-a-century ago) was to endeavour to bring back the Reformed Church of England into subjection to the Church of Rome. Its leaders appear to have been actuated by as blind a hatred of Protestantism then as the leading Ritualists are now. Thus in Froude's *Remains*, published in 1835, we are taught "to hate the Reformation and the Reformers more and more." The *British Critic*, of July, 1841, declared that "the Protestant tone of doctrine is essentially anti-Christian," and that their object was "the *un-Protestantizing* (to use an offensive but forcible word) of the National Church. As we go on we must recede more and more from the principles, if such there be, of the English Reformation,"

compelled to appeal to their bishop for protection against the illegal and unauthorized acts by which the minister of the parish was outraging the feelings of his Protestant parishioners. About the same time the churchwardens of St. Mary's, Soho, in London, and a deputation, waited upon their diocesan, asking him to compel their newly-appointed Protestant minister virtually to "*perjure*" himself, by adopting the illegal acts of his predecessor, an ultra-Ritualist, by compelling him to continue "the eastward position, vestments, and the altar lights." The Bishop of London pointed out to the deputation the meaning of their request, inasmuch as "*they asked him to require a clergyman, who felt himself bound to obey the law, not to obey the law;*" and with this mild rebuke dismissed the astonished deputation. Had the Bishop of London only added, that they were not only endeavouring to compel their minister to perjure himself, but also to commit certain heathenish, non-primitive, and anti-Christian acts, he would have done no more than his duty; as every bishop of our Protestant Church is pledged most solemnly at his consecration "to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God's Word," as well as "all unquiet, disobedient, and criminous men to correct and punish."

In 1873, Mr. Mackonochie, in an address to the congregation of St. Alban's, Holborn, describes *Protestantism* as follows:—

"I am sure you have learnt to hate with a growing and ever-deepening intensity that cold, miserable, unloving, *godless figment* called *Protestantism*."

These sayings, and much more could be added of a similar nature if necessary, are sufficient to prove that the unsanctified heart of man, whether a heathen's of the second century or a Christian minister's of the nineteenth, is painfully at variance with the Apostolic precepts of "submitting yourselves one to another in the fear of God," and "in lowliness of mind let each esteem other better than themselves."

(3.) Tertullian, in his *Apology*, supposed to have been written A.D. 200, thus speaks on the subject of *incense*:—

“We do not forget the debt of gratitude we owe to God our Lord and Creator. We reject no creature at His hands, though we exercise restraint upon ourselves, lest we make any gift of His a sinful use. We certainly buy no *incense*, though the Arabians may be assured that their costly merchandise is expended as largely in the burying of Christians, as in the heathen practice of censing their gods. As servants of God we render homage to Him alone, offering to Him, as He requires, that costly and noble sacrifice of prayer, despatched from a chaste body, an unstained soul, and a sanctified spirit, but *not a grain of incense*, the tears of an Arabian tree, which can be bought for a farthing.”⁸

There is a disputed reading in an expression of the above quotation, as some copies of Tertullian read, “*we certainly buy incense*,” in place of the negative; but whichever may be the true reading, it is quite clear, both from the context and the drift of Tertullian’s argument, that whenever Christians used “incense” it was for the purpose of *embalming the dead*, not for the worship of the living, as was the case with the heathen alone. I have recently met with *A Liturgical Essay*, by Dr. Littledale, written in defence of the Ritualistic use of *incense* in public worship, as was practised, he considers, by the Primitive Church. But the weakness of his arguments will be seen at a glance, when it is known that he adduces Athenagoras’ *omission* “of the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper” as decisive against his condemnation of the use of incense by Christians in public worship!!⁹; as well as in quoting an expression of

⁸ Tertullian, *Apolog.*, §§ 30, 42.

⁹ As a further specimen of Dr. Littledale’s mode of proving that “incense” was employed in worship by the Primitive Church, he says, “the word used in the original of Revelation vi. 9 for *altar*, is *thusiasterion*, which of course is the Seventy’s name for the altar of incense of the elder dispensation.”!!! (p. 7.) It is difficult to see how the legality of *incense* in the Christian Church is proved by St. John’s vision of the martyrs’ souls “under the altar,” but it is not difficult to show that Dr. Littledale is wrong in assuming that the Greek fathers used the term *thusiasterion* as a Jewish altar in place of the holy table, whereat the Lord’s Supper was administered. One quotation, already noticed, will be sufficient to expose his error. Socrates, the historian, has a passage which fully explains the meaning which the Greek Christians attached to the term, “shutting

Augustine without giving the reference, "We do not journey into Arabia to obtain *incense*. God asks from us a sacrifice of praise." For Dr. Littledale argues that as "Augustine belonged to that African Church which differed in so many details from the rest of Christendom," *therefore he is no authority in the matter at all !!!* (p. 15.)

If Dr. Littledale thinks by such arguments to uphold the lawfulness of incense in public worship, we can only express our surprise at the simplicity of the Ritualistic mind, and say, "Peace to all such reasoners."

(4.) The *Sibylline Oracles*, however valueless they may be, as containing supposed prophecies inspired by God, are a sufficient testimony of the practice of the Primitive Church on the subject of *Images*, *Lights* when not required, and *Incense*; all of which the heathen used in their religious services, and which the Church of Rome, and the Ritualists of the present time, have copied from them; as they pronounce with no unfaltering voice what was *unlawful* for the Christians to do :—

"It is *not lawful* for us to enter the shrines of temples,
Nor, where *images* are, to worship with prayer and libations,
Nor yet to honour the fanes with manifold fragrance of flowers,
Nor with the *shining of lamps*, nor with the offerings hung on columns;
Nor that altars should flame emitting *incense* perfumed."¹

(5.) And so Arnobius, at the beginning of the fourth century, argues thus against heathenism for their use of *incense* in their religious worship :—

"We have now to say a few words about *incense* as connected with your

himself up alone in the church called *Irene*, and approaching the altar, (*thusiasterion*,) throwing himself on his face beneath *the holy table*, he prays with tears." (Soer., *Ecel. Hist.*, i. 37.)

¹ *Sib. Orac.*, viii. 488—492. The *Sibylline Oracles*, which we now have in eight books, are not the same which were kept at Rome with so much care, and written long before the Christian era, but the production of some Christian writer during the second century, as Cave, Prideaux, and Lardner agree in supposing. They are mentioned by Justin Martyr, (*Apol. Prim.*, ch. xx.) and often regarded as heathen fragments interpolated by unscrupulous men in later times.

ritual, and largely used in your religious acts. With respect to this incense so used, we ask you particularly to consider when you first became acquainted with it, or whether it is worthy to be offered to your deities. For it is almost a novelty; and it is only lately that it has been known in these parts, and has won its way into the shrines of the gods. If, therefore, in olden times neither men nor gods sought for this *incense*, it only proves that what you heathen offer uselessly and in vain, which the ancients did not believe necessary, you do it without any reason at all!"²

I think that sufficient proof has been adduced to show that the use of incense in religious worship was confined exclusively to the heathen predecessors of the Church of Rome in olden times, as it was totally unknown to the Primitive Christians of those early days.

As regards the law of the Church of England on the subject of *Vestments*, *Lights*, and *Incense*, though they have one and all been pronounced *illegal* by the Supreme Ordinary of the Church, whom every clergyman is pledged to obey, still as the Ritualistic clergy have consciences sufficiently elastic to allow them to set aside that judgment, upon various pleas, either that it was *bad law*, in the opinion of those who refused to abide by it; or it was given in an *undefended suit*, as in the *Purchas* case, and therefore might be safely disregarded; or that it was given upon the advice of a certain number of *laymen*, whose opinion, according to Mr. Bennett, was of no more value than "the first ten men picked out of the street;" or that it was contrary to what they curiously call the teaching of the "*Primitive and Catholic*" Church;—it behoves us to show how vain and useless all these pleas are against the opinions of two such distinguished lawyers as the late and present Lord Chancellor, who must surely be better judges of what the law of the Church of England really is than the angry replies of mere heated partisans, such as our Ritualistic brethren have too often proved themselves to be.

In the year 1866, a case was submitted to counsel on behalf of the archbishops and bishops of England as to the legal meaning of what is commonly known as the "Ornaments

² Arnob., *Adv. Gentes.*, lib. vii. § 26.

Rubric," and this is the reply of the four lawyers consulted, two of the signatures being those of "Roundell Palmer," then Attorney-General, subsequently Lord Chancellor Selbourne, and of Sir "H. M. Cairns," the present Lord Chancellor:—

"We are of opinion that a clergyman of the Established Church administering the Holy Communion in a parish church habited in the *vestments* prescribed by Edward the Sixth's *First Prayer Book*, 1549, *infringes the law*, and *commits an offence cognizable by a legal tribunal*.

"We are of opinion that the use of *two or more lights* on the Communion table, *not for giving light*, but as an ingredient in the service itself, or the use of the *incense* or wafer bread, or the mixed cup, or hymns before or after consecration, is *unauthorized and illegal*."

Will any rational man venture to contradict the opinions of such well-qualified judges, and such unbiassed laymen, on questions as to the legality of clergymen of the Church of England adopting the use of "vestments," "lights," or "incense" in the service of the sanctuary?—putting aside for a moment the conclusive fact that the Supreme Ordinary of the Church, whom every clergyman has most solemnly sworn to obey, has ruled with authority, which no loyal Churchman can for a moment question, that the aforesaid things, as accessories in the administration of the Lord's Supper, are **ILLEGAL**?

CHAPTER XII.

THE EASTWARD POSITION.

It has long been the custom with certain members of the Church of England to turn towards what they suppose to be the *East* at the public recital of the Creeds, during divine service. This peculiarity has been carried further by the Ritualistic clergy, who teach and practise that it is the duty of the minister at the Lord's Supper to consecrate the elements with his back to the people, or, as they prefer to term it, in the "eastward position," though of course most erroneously whenever a church happens to stand otherwise than due east and west.

While, therefore, the "eastward position" for the minister at the Lord's Supper is utterly without warrant of Holy Scripture, or of the Primitive Christians, or of the Book of Common Prayer, when interpreted by the plain rules of reason and common sense, there can be no doubt that the custom of praying towards the *east* was an ancient idolatrous practice. We learn from the Old Testament that the Jews were obliged to worship towards the *west*, and the temple was so constructed that the Holy of Holies was placed at the western part. The reason was because the idolatrous Orientalists, such as the Babylonians, Egyptians, Phœnicians, Persians, &c., worshipped the sun with their faces naturally turned towards the place of his rising, *the east*.³ At the time of the Exodus, before taking possession of the promised land, when they were about to be brought into close proximity with the surrounding idolatrous nations, the

³ It is a curious fact, as Dean Stanley notices in the *Contemporary Review*, that in their facings for worship "the Mussulmen turn to the *east*, the Pope to the *west*, the Hindoos to the *north*, and old-fashioned Anglicans to the *south*."

Jews were cautioned against worshipping the sun, the penalty of which form of idolatry was death;⁴ and a thousand years later the prophet Ezekiel, in his description of the abominations with which his unhappy countrymen were mixed up, mentions specially that the greatest abominations of them all was the act of "about twenty-five men at the door of the temple of the Lord, between the porch and the altar, *with their backs toward the temple of the Lord, and their faces toward the east.*"⁵

(1.) It was an item in the worship of pagan Rome at the time when the Gospel was first preached to mankind for idolaters to worship with their faces in "the eastward position," and when it was found that a fondness for this ancient custom facilitated the admission of converts, it was silently adopted and permitted in the Christian Church. Hence we find one of the early fathers teaching as follows:—

"Since the dawn is an image of the day of birth, and from that point the light which has shone forth at first from the darkness increases, there has also dawned on those involved in darkness a day of the knowledge of truth. In correspondence with the manner of the sun's rising, prayers are made looking towards the sunrise *in the east*. Whence also the most ancient heathen temples looked towards the east *when facing the images.*"⁶

(2.) Here we have an admission of the image worship of the heathen, and the position of their temples being the cause of prayer being offered in the "eastward position;" but as Christian churches in primitive times were not built as they are in modern days, east and west, we have no guide for our modern practice in this respect. One of the earliest churches mentioned in history is the one at Tyre, built at the commencement of the fourth century, on which Eusebius has delivered himself of a long panegyric, comparing it for splendour to Solomon's Temple, and in his description he particularly specifies "the three gates on entrance *towards the rising of the sun.*"⁷ And the same author, in his *Life of Constantine*, mentions a

⁴ Deut. iv. 19; xvii. 2—5.

⁵ Ezek. viii. 15, 16.

⁶ Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromata*, lib. vii. c. 7.

⁷ Eusebius, *Eccles. Hist.*, lib. x. c. 4.

beautiful church at Jerusalem, with its "three gates suitably *facing the rising sun* for the multitude to enter,"⁸ which sufficiently proves that in those days the entrance to a church was on the *eastern* side, and the Communion table stood at the *west*; so that the officiating minister, if he had adopted the modern practice of our Ritualistic clergy at the administration of the Lord's Supper, would have not only turned his back upon the congregation, where the Saviour's presence was more especially promised, but he would have been worshipping with his face towards *the west*.

(3.) Another ecclesiastical historian, writing about a century later, mentions an exception to the general rule in the case of a church built at Antioch in Syria, where the holy table faced eastward in place of westward, because, as he says, "the site of this church is inverted."⁹

(4.) And so in the fifth century, as Archbishop Usher tells us on the authority of Jocelin, the biographer of St. Patrick, that the famous Irish saint, who was evidently a wise and not a superstitious man, when building a church near Down in Ulster, built it so that it stood neither east nor west, but *north and south*.

(5.) We have seen from Clemens Alexandrinus that the custom of worshipping towards the east was a very early practice amongst some Christians; and it had the bad effect of causing them to be suspected of worshipping the sun, as Tertullian says, "The idea no doubt arose from our being known to turn *to the east* in prayer."¹

⁸ Eusebius, *De Vitâ Const.*, lib. iii. c. 37. It is probable that the early Christians selected the "eastward position" for the gate of entrance to the church, in direct opposition to that of our uncatholic Ritualists, on account of the description given by Ezekiel of the future Millennial Temple and of the revelation of the glory of God. "Afterward he brought me to the gate that looketh *toward the east*: and behold the glory of the God of Israel came from *the way of the east*; and the earth shined with His glory." (ch. xliii. 42.)

⁹ Socrates, *Eccles. Hist.*, lib. v. c. 22.

¹ Tertull., *Apol.*, c. xvi.

(6.) Between two and three centuries after the time of Tertullian, we find Pope Leo I. (A.D. 440—461) alluding to this unwise toleration of heathen customs, as he says :—

“ From such institutions proceeds this impiety, that the rising sun is worshipped from the hills by some of the weaker sort of people, *which some Christians also hold to be so very religious an observance among them*, that before they come to the Church of St. Peter, they turn themselves back towards the rising sun, and bow down their heads in honour of that splendid orb, which we perceive to be owing partly to ignorance, *partly to a spirit of paganism*, and that to our no small grief and affliction, because, although some perhaps may rather worship the Creator of this fair luminary than the light itself, which is only a creature, *yet ought we to abstain from the very appearance of this sort of devotion toward it*; which, when one of our heathen converts shall observe amongst us, will he not retain as probable that part of his old opinion which he sees to be common both to *Christians and infidels*? Let therefore this *damnable act of perverseness* (*damnanda perversitas*) be far from the practice of the faithful.”²

(7.) Athanasius, however, writing in the fourth century, had declared pointedly :—

“ We do not worship towards the east, as if we thought God more peculiarly dwelt there, but because God is in Himself, and so styled in Scripture, the true light.”³

(8.) And Augustine (*De Serm. Dom. in Monte*, lib. ii. c. 5) argues much in the same way. Nevertheless, the fathers were ignorant of its origin; as Basil asks, “ What Scripture has taught us to pray towards the east? ” And Durandus, a celebrated Roman Ritualist of the twelfth century, places the matter upon its true ground, viz., *submission to the orders of the Pope*, as he writes :—

“ The priest at the altar and in divine service ought, from the institution of Pope Vigilius, to pray towards the east. Whence in churches having their doors from the *west*, when celebrating the mass, in salutation he turns himself from the people. . . . But in churches having their doors from the *east*, as at Rome, turning in salutation, *the priest celebrating in them always turns to the people.*”

² Leo. I., Sermo. vii. *In Solemn. Nativ. Dom. Nostr. Jesu Christi.*

³ Athan., *Ad Antioch.*, Quest. 37. Alluding to Zech. vi, 12, where Christ is termed in the Septuagint Version “ THE EAST.”

As the modern practice of building churches with a west entrance has superseded the more ancient custom, the minister who thinks it necessary to pray in an *eastward* direction must of necessity turn his back to the people. It would be more scriptural if those who make such an important point of this useless and immaterial custom realized the teaching of our blessed Lord respecting His presence with His people: "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, *there am I* in the midst of them." (Matt. xviii. 20.) That was the place, as St. John (xx. 19) tells us, which He assumed the last time He appeared in any assembly on earth. Hence it is evident that *any minister who turns his face away from the midst of the congregation, when engaged in public worship, plainly turns his back on Christ Himself*, as well as on His own representation of the very place of His presence.

But has our Reformed Church pronounced what is the lawful position for a minister to assume, especially when engaged in the administration of the Lord's Supper? This point has been decided by the Supreme Ordinary in the well-known *Purchas* case,⁴ that it is *not lawful* for the minister when so engaged to stand with his back to the people, or to assume, as the Ritualists

⁴ See judgment of the Lords of the Judicial Committee of Privy Council, delivered Feb. 23rd, 1871; and subsequently confirmed by the Queen's Majesty—Present: The Lord Chancellor, Archbishop of York, Bishop of London, Lord Chelmsford; especially that portion of the judgment relating to the 17th Article, concerning the respondent's habit "at the Holy Communion of standing with his back to the people." I am aware that a large number of clergy, said to number 7,000, have passed a censure upon this judgment, which, as it has been well remarked, "perhaps not 700 of them have read, and upon which perhaps not 70 were qualified by their reading to pass an opinion," (*Quarterly Review*, Oct., 1874, p. 561;) but it is difficult to know how any loyal Churchman can, consistent with his oath to obey the Supreme Ordinary, refuse to accept her ruling on this matter. The Archbishop of Canterbury very properly rebuked these lawless memorialists, after passing by their unworthy insinuations against the judges of the land, reminding them "that the chief pastors of our Church are of all men the very last who ought to be requested to set to this nation *the example of refusing obedience to the highest tribunals.*"

erroneously term it, the “eastward position”—a judgment which must commend itself, not only to every loyal Churchman, but to every one who is capable of interpreting language in its plain and literal meaning, and not in a non-natural sense; and though those who practically disregard the Apostolic precept, “obey them that have the rule over you,” may refuse obedience to the law upon the futile ground that it was an undefended suit, no one, whose mind has not been warped by a system of ecclesiastical casuistry, will permit himself to be led astray by such a plea as this.

The historic evidence respecting the opinion of our Reformers on this subject is very clear. The “eastward position” of the minister at the time of administering the Lord’s Supper was rejected by the Second Prayer Book of King Edward VI., (1552,) which orders “the priest to stand at *the north side of the table*” throughout the service; whereas, in the First Prayer Book (1549) the order was—“The priest standing humbly *afore the midst of the altar,*” which shows distinctly the difference between the two. The rejection of the “altar position,” as it might be more properly termed, has been maintained in all the revisions of the Prayer Book down to the present day. In the judgment on the *Purchas* case there is an allusion to “the dispute between the Vicar of Grantham and his parishioners, (1627,)” who appealed to their diocesan for redress; and the reply of Bishop Williams, then of Lincoln, and subsequently Archbishop of York, is well worthy of perusal, not only as showing how the law was interpreted at that period, but as containing such excellent advice, that it would be well if all our present bishops would advise their clergy in the same way during the present distress. It is satisfactory, however, to know that the Bishop of Carlisle, in an address, Nov. 26th, 1874, declared that “the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice,⁵ which *the eastward position* was intended to symbolise, could not be

⁵ In the reign of Edward VI. a proclamation, which is given in Cardwell’s *Documentary Annals*, was put forth by authority, in which Holy Scripture alone is allowed to be the ultimate appeal on the doctrine of the Eucharist, and all discussions on its mysteries are forbidden.

proved from Holy Scripture, and was repugnant to the teaching of our Church."

The Church is much indebted to the Rev. Edward Garbett for having recently published Bishop William's letter in full, from which I make the following extracts:—

"Queen Elizabeth's Commissioners directed that *the table* should stand, not where the *altar*, but where the *steps of the altar* formerly stood,—the minister appointed to read the Communion is directed to read the Commandments, not at the end, but at the north side of the table, which implies the end to be placed towards the east great window. Nor was this a new direction in the Queen's time only, but practised in King Edward's reign; for in the plot of our Liturgy sent by Masters Knox and Wittingham to Master Calvin, in the reign of Queen Mary, it is said that *the minister must stand at the north side of the table*," &c.

Then Bishop Williams alludes to the changes in the Liturgies of the two Prayer Books of King Edward's reign, which I have given above, and concludes his letter as follows:—

"The sum of all this: 1. You may not erect an *altar* where the canons only admit a Communion table. 2. This *table* must not stand *altarwise*, and you at the north end thereof, but *tablewise*, as you must officiate at the *north side* of the same. 3. This table ought to be laid up (decently covered) in the chancel only, as I suppose, but ought not to be officiated upon, either in the first or second service, as you distinguish, but in that place of the church or chancel where you may be seen and heard of all. . . . Whither side soever you or your parish shall yield to the other, *in this needless controversy*, shall remain, in my poor judgment, the more discreet, grave, and learned of the two. And by that time you have gained some more experience *in the cure of souls*, you shall find *no such ceremony as Christian charity*."

A work entitled *The Alliance of Divine Offices*, by L'Estrange, a High Church divine, published thirty years later than Bishop Williams' letter to the Vicar of Grantham, and republished in the Anglo-Catholic Library in 1846, will show what was the interpretation of the rubric at the time of the last revision of our Prayer Book in 1661. The author, referring to the subject before us, writes as follows:—

"As for the priest standing *at the north side of the table*, this seemeth to avoid the fashion of the priest's standing *with his face towards the east*, as is the *Popish practice*,"

From an illustrated Catechism published by Bishop Gauden, one of the High Church bishops in the reign of James II., and the supposed author or editor of the *eikon basilike*, we learn that at that period the Communion table ordinarily stood, as now, with its ends north and south; but when the Lord's Supper was administered, it was moved into the choir, and placed with its ends *east* and *west*, so that the officiating minister could stand on the north side of the holy table and consecrate the elements "before" him and in the sight of the people; the reason being given as follows:—

"Q.—Why doth the priest stand on the north side of the table?"

"A.—To avoid the *Popish superstition* of standing towards the east."—(p. 203.)

And so in the Nonjuring Communion Office of 1718, a sort of revised Prayer Book by Archbishop Sancroft and other High Churchmen of the period, a reprint of which has been published by Hall, in his *Fragmenta Liturgica*, the following note is given in the Order for the Administration of the Holy Communion:—

"Note, that whenever in this office the priest is directed to turn to the altar, or to stand or kneel *before it*, or with his face towards it, it is always meant that he should stand or kneel *on the north side thereof*."

All this historical testimony will explain the action of the House of Commons in their impeachment of Bishops Wren and Cosin in the seventeenth century. Bishop Wren was accused of using—

"Superstitious and idolatrous actions and gestures in the administration of the Lord's Supper, consecrating the bread and wine, standing *on the west side of the table*, with his face to the east, and *his back to the people*, elevating the bread and wine, so that they were seen over his shoulders."

In the case of Bishop Cosin, the impeachment ran as follows:—

"That it is a ceremony *the Pope's priests* are enjoined to use at mass—viz., *turning their backs to the people*."

As a curious commentary upon what has already been adduced respecting these ancient heathen customs, such as the *eastward position, vestments, useless lights, &c., &c.*, which the Ritualists

have introduced at the present time, in contradiction to the practice of the Primitive Church, and to that which has been pronounced illegal by the Supreme Ordinary in our Reformed Church, the *Times* of August 4th, 1874, contains a letter from the Rev. Arthur Tooth, Vicar of St. James', Hatcham, in which the writer says :—

“ There are points of ritual which we are prepared to sacrifice *anything* for; I mean the *eastward position at the altar*, the use of *lights and vestments*, for they involve the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, and we would as soon give up one as deny the other.”

Seeing that the points named by Mr. Tooth have been already pronounced illegal by due authority, and no rational person can for a moment doubt that the new Court formed by the Public Worship Regulation Bill, armed with power to enforce submission to its decisions, will hesitate to confirm the previous judgments, it will be interesting to observe what *the Sacrifice* which Mr. Tooth and his co-Ritualists are prepared to make on behalf of their principles. Can it mean “*anything but*” their livings and their status in a Protestant Church, whose authorities they ignore and whose principles they betray?

Moreover, as Dr. Pusey, the leader of this school of religious thought in our Church, is reported to have said in a speech at St. James' Hall that “the standing before the altar (*i.e.*, the eastward position) means the primitive doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and the bowing after the Sarum use at the consecration means Eucharistic adoration,” we see clearly that the claim of the progressive party in the present day is to make “the eastward position,” like the “vestments” question, symbolical of distinctive doctrines. They are demanded as necessary to make the Ritualistic or sacerdotal clergy the more readily to enforce, by symbolic actions, doctrines which are not the doctrines of the Reformed Church of England, and were totally unknown to the faithful in primitive times.

It is worthy of note that the Roman Church, of which in many things the ultra-Ritualists appear to be profoundly ignorant, notwithstanding their frequent boast of being one with Rome “in faith, orders, and sacraments,” does not always

make the "eastward position" a *sine quâ non* in the same sense that our unfaithful clergy appear to do; *e.g.*, in Marriott's *Vestiarium Christianum* (Plate 43) there is a representation of "St. Clement at the Altar," from a fresco of the eleventh century, in which he is represented celebrating mass, and standing at the north side or north end of a square "altar," in the same position as all the faithful amongst the bishops and clergy of the Church of England have stood during the last three centuries when administering the Lord's Supper. On the "altar" itself there is a chalice and a patin, and a service book, so placed that it could only be read by the minister when standing *at the north side or north end of the "altar,"* which is conclusive evidence of the practice of the Church of Rome in the eleventh century.

That such has been the universal practice in our Church since the Reformation we may gather from the authoritative decision of so high a Churchman as the late Bishop Phillpotts, who, when appealed to on the subject respecting the conduct of the Rev. E. G. Harvey in turning his back upon the congregation during the Communion service, ruled as follows:—

"I take order for quieting the said doubt by saying that I interpret the rubric to mean that the priest is to stand before the table while he so ordereth the bread and wine, that he may with the more readiness and decency take the cup into his hands and break the bread before the people, and *afterwards to stand as before,*" *i.e.*, at the north side or north end of the holy table.⁶

To this testimony as to the proper meaning of the rubric, I will add that of another High Churchman, the late Professor Blunt, of Cambridge, who, in his *Lectures on the Duties of the Parish Priest*, says:—

"This rubric has ministered cause of debate. 'The priest standing *before the table,*' you will take notice, is a different phrase from 'standing at the *north side of the table,*' and implies a different thing—viz., that he shall stand in front of the table, with his back to the people, till he has '*ordered*' the elements, and prepared them for the rite, interposing his

⁶ See letter of Archdeacon Phillpotts to the *Guardian*, May 12th, 1871.

person between the congregation and the table, till whatever is merely *mechanical* in the act shall have been completed, the Church not wishing to make the meaner part of the service a spectacle.

“This done, he returns to the north side and breaks the bread, and takes the cup ‘before the people,’ *i.e.*, *in their sight*—the Church not wishing to make the manner of consecration, as the Romish priest does, a mystery. Thus the former position was merely taken up in order to the subsequent act, that the priest ‘*may*, with the more readiness and decency, break the bread.’ So that they mistake this rubric altogether, I apprehend, and *violate both its letter and spirit who consecrate the elements with their backs to the people, after the manner of the Church of Rome.* All that they have to do in that position is to *order* the elements, so that they *may* afterwards break the bread and take the cup with more decency.” (p. 333.)

It is satisfactory to find that between five and six thousand clergy are sufficiently alive to the danger of the “eastward position,” which Canon Ryle has justly characterised as “the outward and visible sign of an unscriptural, mischievous, and soul-injuring doctrine,” for which the Ritualistic party are now so earnestly struggling, as to have petitioned our authorities against permitting the legality of so vain and useless a ceremony; but as this point has been once authoritatively settled in the Purchas case, every loyal Churchman, who has regard to the sanctity of the most solemn vows, will cheerfully and readily obey those who are set over them in the Lord.

In a Catechism published by the Ritualists, entitled *The Ritual Reason Why*, the reason of the officiating minister turning his back upon the people, or assuming the “eastward position” during the Prayer of Consecration in the Communion Service, is thus stated:—“Because this is the position of a *sacrificing priest*,” (p. 137.) This is frank; but when such passages in Scripture as Revelation v. 6, Hebrews x. 11, are quoted in support of their unscriptural and uncatholic view, we detect at once the blindness to the truth which is so marked a characteristic of the Ritualistic school. We have already seen that the Primitive Christians knew nothing whatever of “a sacrificing priesthood,” save that “holy and royal priesthood” described by St. Peter as pertaining to every believer, who is taught by the Holy Ghost to offer the sacrifice of himself to the

service of his Lord. When the Ritualists are venturesome enough to bring forth such a passage as Revelation v. 6—

“And I beheld, and, lo, in the midst of the throne and of the four beasts, and in the midst of the elders, stood a lamb as it had been slain, having seven horns and seven eyes, which are the seven Spirits of God sent forth into all the earth”—

as an argument in favour of the “eastward position,” they must surely calculate upon the boundless credulity and amazing ignorance of all Scripture on the part of their “bewitched” followers.

If the Ritualists were, as they loudly pretend, a really learned body of men, they would acknowledge that even in the Roman Church, which they so fondly imitate, the Pope or Pontifex Maximus of that communion, when sacrificing in St. Peter’s, invariably celebrates mass on festivals at the great altar which looks towards the people. Hence, says Dr. Rock, a very high authority on the subject:—

“Anciently the altar did not lean, as at present, against the wall of the sanctuary, but stood out isolated, and was so arranged that the priest or Pontiff who offered up the unbloody sacrifice upon it should *turn his face, and not, as now, his back towards the people*. Hence both the altar and the portals of the church were directed towards the east.”⁷

Thus it appears that, without attaching the slightest importance to any position which the minister assumes in public worship, the doctrine of a sacrifice, which our English Ritualists imagine to be inseparably connected with “the eastward position,” and with turning their backs upon the people, is by the highest authorities in the Roman Church connected with a position exactly the reverse, which is adopted equally by the Pope and the Protestant Church of England.

⁷ *Hierurgia*, ii. 727.

CHAPTER XIII.

AURICULAR CONFESSION.

"It is most evident and plain that this Auricular Confession hath not the warrant of God's word," is the faithful declaration of the Church of England in her *Homily on Repentance*. Our Ritualistic brethren appear to think otherwise, as we may judge from the petition, signed by nearly five hundred clergymen calling themselves "Priests of the Church of England," which was presented to the Upper House of Convocation during the year 1873, asking the bishops to appoint a class of priests specially *educated* for the purpose, to receive confessions before partaking of the Lord's Supper—such confessions to be made, as the term implies, solely to the ear of a priest, who claims a power to absolve the penitent from all and every sin.

It is scarcely necessary to remark that there is no such thing as "auricular confession" to fallible man to be found in the Word of God; though there is undoubted authority for confession of sin to that ear which is always open to our prayers, who alone can hear and answer prayer and pardon sin. The whole doctrine of confession of sin may be said to be contained in these few passages of Holy Writ. In the Old Testament it is written: "Whoso confesseth and *forsaketh* his sin shall have mercy."⁸ In the New: "If we confess our sins, God is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness."⁹ The passage in James, (v. 16,) which some have been rash enough to adduce in support of auricular confession, "Confess your faults one to another, and pray for one another," proves certainly that Christians should *mutually* confess their faults, when occasion requires, to one another, just as

⁸ Prov. xxviii. 13.

⁹ 1 John i. 9.

they are equally commanded *to pray for one another*; and if there be any authority from this text for the laity to confess to the clergy, there is exactly the same authority for the clergy to confess to the laity. But this would not accord with the "sacerdotal" theory which is now running counter to the laws of God and man.

But inasmuch as the Ritualists are perpetually boasting of their adherence to the teaching and customs of the "Primitive and Catholic" Church, it will be for us to consider how far the teaching of the early Christians accords with what they assert to be the doctrine of auricular confession. The difference between the two may be summarily expressed as follows:—The teaching of the Primitive Church, and for many ages after, was, as our quotations will prove, that confession on the part of the penitent was to be made to Him who alone can hear prayer and pardon sin. The teaching of Romanists and Ritualists alike, as we must conclude from the petition of the latter, in number 480, to Convocation for a set of "duly qualified confessors, in accordance with the provisions of canon law," on account of "the wide-spread and increasing use of sacramental confession,"—is that confession should be made previous to the reception of the Lord's Supper to the ear of a fellow-sinner, who claims to stand in the place of the Almighty and to pardon sin. Hence, as Archbishop Usher justly remarked two centuries ago, in his defence of the primitive practice against the accretions of Roman superstition:—

"The thing which we reject is that new picklock of sacramental confession, obtruded upon men's consciences, as a matter necessary to salvation, by the canons of the late Conventicle of Trent, where those good fathers put their curse upon every one that either shall 'deny that sacramental confession was ordained by divine right, and is by the same right necessary to salvation.' This doctrine we cannot but reject as repugnant to that which we have learned both from the Scriptures and from the fathers."¹

This practice of "auricular confession" may be traced back, like so many other doctrines of the Church of Rome, to the ancient practices of the heathen, which formerly prevailed in

¹ Usher's *Answer to a Jesuit*, ch. iv.

Babylon and Greece. It was the custom, when any one was admitted into the "Eleusinian mysteries," for the priest who admitted the candidate to propose certain questions, such as—"Are you fasting?" "Are you free from murder?" "Are you chaste?" &c. &c.; and when these questions were satisfactorily answered, "duly qualified" priests, termed *koës*, heard the confessions of the penitents, and absolved them of their sins.

(1.) Now to consider the testimony of the Primitive Church on the question as to whom confession was due, we find *Barnabas*, the companion of St. Paul, when describing *the way of light* which the penitent should pursue, says,—

"Thou shalt confess thy sins; and not come to thy *prayers* with an evil conscience. This is the way of light."²

Here it is quite clear that as the writer meant to inculcate the duty of prayer to Him who alone can hear and answer prayer, so must all confession be made to Him alone.

(2.) The language of *Clement* of Rome, who is mentioned by St. Paul in *Philippians*, (iv. 3,) is still more decisive, for he says:—

"The Lord, brethren, stands in need of nothing; and He desires nothing of any one, *except that confession be made to Him*."³

(3.) *Clement* of Alexandria, of the second century, shows that the Christians of his age knew nothing of the necessity of making confession to man previous to the reception of the Lord's Supper, as he says:—

"In the dispensation of the Eucharist, some consider that every one individually should take his part. *One's own conscience* is best for choosing accurately or shunning. And its firm foundation is a right life with proper instruction. But the imitation of those who are most upright in their lives, is most excellent for the understanding and practice of the Commandments. Therefore, as the Apostle says, Let a man *examine himself*, and so let him eat of the bread and drink of the cup."⁴

² Epistle of Barnabas, ch. xix.

³ Clem. Rom., First Epist. to the Corinthians, c. iii.

⁴ Clem. Alex., *Stromata*, lib. i. c. 1.

(4.) Origen, in the third century, thus speaks on the subject :—

“ See what Divine Scripture teaches us, that *the declaration of iniquity is the confession of sin*. Wherefore look about thee diligently to whom thou oughtest to confess thy sins. Try first the good Physician, who knoweth how to be weak with him that is weak, to weep with him that weepeth, and who being full of compassion can forgive iniquity and sin.”⁵

(5.) Hilary, Bishop of Poitiers, in the fourth century, declares the Catholic truth when writing :—

“ David teaches us to *confess to none other but the Lord*, who hath made the olive fruitful with the hope of mercy.”⁶

(6.) Basil, Bishop of Cæsarea, of the same age, is no less clear in teaching that confession should alone be made to God, as his words are as follows :—

“ I do not confess with my lips, that I may manifest unto many ; but inwardly in my heart, shutting my eyes. To Thee alone, who seest the things that are in secret, do I groan, mourning within myself ; for *the groanings of my heart are sufficient for confession*, and the lamentations poured forth to Thee, my God, from the depth of my soul.”⁷

(7.) Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, the contemporary of Basil, speaks in the same strain :—

“ Tears wash away sin which men are ashamed to confess with the voice. Weeping provides at once both for pardon and bashfulness ; tears speak our faith without horror ; tears confess our crimes without any offence to modesty or shamefacedness.”⁸

(8.) The great Augustine, who lived into the fifth century, in his celebrated work, condemns the whole system of *auricular confession*, with this pertinent question :—

“ What have I to do with men, that *they should hear my confessions, as if they could heal all my infirmities*—a race curious to know the lives of others, but slothful to amend their own ? Why seek they to hear from me what I am, who will not hear from Thee what they themselves are ?”⁹

⁵ Origen, *Homily 11 in Psalm 37*.

⁶ Hilary, *in Psalm 52*.

⁷ Basil, *in Psalm 28*.

⁸ Ambrose, *in Luc. 23*.

⁹ Augustine's *Confessions*, lib. x. c. 3.

(9.) Chrysostom, the Patriarch of Constantinople, the contemporary of Augustine, is still more positive in his teaching that *Christians should confess to God alone*; as he says in one of his Homilies:—

“I bid thee not to accuse thyself to others; but I advise thee to observe the prophet’s direction, reveal thy way unto the Lord,—*confess thy sins before God*; praying, if not with thy tongue, yet at least with thy memory, and so look to obtain mercy.”¹

In another place Chrysostom advises:—

“I beseech you, *make your confession continually to God*; for I do not bring thee into the presence of thy fellow-servants, neither do I constrain to make thy sins known unto men: unfold thy conscience to God, and show Him thy wounds, and ask the cure of Him.”²

In a third place the same great authority says:—

“It is not necessary that thou shouldst confess in the presence of witnesses. Let the inquiry after thy sins be made *in thy own thoughts*. Let this judgment be without any witness: *let God only see thee confessing*.”³

There are about twenty passages in Chrysostom’s writings to the same purpose, proving beyond the shadow of a doubt, in the mind of every Catholic Christian, that the Church, as late as the fifth century, had never heard of such a thing as auricular or sacramental confession. These passages have been collected by M. Daillé⁴ in his exhaustive work on that subject, where he not only vindicates these passages from the subtle evasions of Papal controversialists, but shows clearly what the Primitive Church held and taught on the subject of *confession to God alone*.

I take this opportunity of mentioning an incident in connection with the subject of *auricular confession* in general, and Chrysostom’s teaching in particular. Having had occasion to quote some of the above-mentioned testimonies of the Primitive Christians against the system of confession as now practised, when speaking at the Exeter Anti-Confessional Meeting in the

¹ Chrysos., *Hom.* 31 in *Heb.*, c. xii. t. iv. Savile’s edit., p. 589.

² Chrysos., *Hom. de Incomprehen. Dei Naturâ*.

³ *Ibid.*, *Hom. de Pœnitent. et Confess.*

⁴ *Daillé de Confess. Auricular.*, lib. iv. cap. xxv.

year 1873, accompanied by the remark that none of the early Christians knew anything of the doctrine of sacramental confession, I was challenged by Mr. Hobson, a Roman priest residing in Exeter, who asserted directly the contrary. Mr. Hobson supported his opinion by the following quotation, taken from what he called *St. Clement's Epistle to St. James*; and so confident did this Roman priest feel on the occasion, that he "heartily invited Mr. Savile to verify the quotations for himself:"—"If any man have any care for the salvation of his soul, let him confess to him who presides—always a bishop or priest;" and also a second quotation, taken from what he described as Chrysostom's *De Sacerdotio*, lib. iii., as follows:—"Let us not be ashamed to confess our faults to the priest. Whoever is ashamed to declare his sins to man, and will not confess them, he shall be confounded in the day of judgment in the face of the whole world."

After pointing out that there was no such work ever heard of as *St. Clement's Epistle to St. James*; and asking Mr. Hobson to let the public know the chapter and verse from which his first quotation was taken, as well as the edition and place of publication of the work in question; and requesting him also to give a more exact reference to the passage cited from the third book of Chrysostom's *De Sacerdotio*, and which I had been unable to discover after a careful examination of both the Greek and Latin versions of the eighteen chapters of which the said book consists;—after a delay of some months, and after having had to repeat my questions no less than *three times* in the local journal in which our controversy was carried on, Mr. Hobson wrote at length, with commendable courage and with amusing naïveté, as follows:—

"I regret to say I quoted *second-hand*, and in one case *third-hand*. Since writing the above I have discovered that, first, the *Epistle of St. Clement to St. James*, from which my first quotation was taken, is *not a genuine work of St. Clement*, therefore that quotation *goes for nothing*; and, second, the quotation from St. Chrysostom is from a work falsely attributed to St. Chrysostom—hence this quotation, too, *goes for nothing*." !!!

Although the Church of Rome in past ages has not hesitated

to sanction forgeries, as in the well-known case of the "Donation of Constantine," in order to obtain her own ends, it is remarkable that a Roman priest of the nineteenth century should betray such marvellous ignorance of the writings of the early fathers, or venture upon so bold and unfounded a statement as is disclosed in the above instance; but it should be a lesson to hasty controversialists not to write on subjects with which they are imperfectly acquainted. In a similar way, Archdeacon Denison once attempted a defence of *sacramental confession* in a sermon preached at Wells Cathedral, A.D. 1873. He there quoted Cranmer, like his prototype Mr. Hobson, upon second-hand authority, as a testimony to the Reformed Church of England, inculcating the doctrine of *sacramental confession*; apparently unaware of the fact, that whereas in 1538, to which period the archdeacon refers, Cranmer sanctioned it when he was, as he admits, under "the veil of darkness," *i.e.*, having only just emancipated himself from the uncatholic teaching of the Church of Rome; whereas, in 1551, when the glorious light of the Gospel had illuminated his soul, the primate pointedly and authoritatively excluded "sacramental confession" from any place or standing in the Reformed and Protestant Church of England.

The earliest known instance of compulsory sacramental confession, according to Cardinal Fleury, is to be found in the regulation of a monastery by Chrodegang, Bishop of Metz, A.D. 763, whose rule was that confession by the resident monks, or as they would be termed in our Protestant Church, "the canons residentiary," should be made twice a year, either to himself or to a priest appointed by him. "This," says the cardinal, "is the *first* time that I find confession commanded."⁵ It required, however, nearly five centuries more of growing superstition and gradual departure from "Primitive and Catholic" truth, before the doctrine of sacramental confession was taught as an article of the faith, which appears to have been done by the individual authority of Pope Innocent III., A.D. 1215,

⁵ Fleury, *Ecccl. Hist.*, lib. xlii., t. ix, p. 425: Paris, 1703.

(the memorable year of our Magna Charta,) according to the decree of the fourth Council of Lateran, as follows :—

“That every man and woman, after they come to years of discretion, should *privately confess their sins to their own priest at least once a year*, and endeavour faithfully to perform the penance enjoined on them; and after this they should come to the Sacrament, at least at Easter, unless the priest, for some reasonable cause, judges it fit for them to abstain for a time. And whoever does not perform this is to be excommunicated from the Church; and if he die, he is not to be allowed Christian burial.”⁶

Thus it appears that nearly twelve centuries had passed after the Holy Ghost had been given on the day of Pentecost, for the purpose of guiding Christians into all truth, before “sacramental confession” became an article of the faith, and yet there are clergy of the Church of England in the nineteenth century venturesome enough to assert that their principles and practices in general, and that concerning “sacramental confession” in particular, have alone the ring of “Primitive and Catholic” truth!!!

The Lateran decree of the thirteenth century, imposing “sacramental confession” on the Church of Christ, was further confirmed by the Council of Trent, which, in supreme contempt of all history, whether as set forth in Holy Scripture or in the writings of the fathers of the Catholic Church, had the hardihood to decree as follows :—

“Whoever shall deny that *sacramental confession was instituted by Divine command*, or that it is necessary to salvation; or shall affirm that the practice of *secretly confessing to the priest alone, as it has ever been observed from the beginning* by the (Roman) Catholic Church, and is still observed, is foreign to the institution and command of Christ, and is a human invention; *let him be accursed.*”

In another decree it is stated :—

“Whoever shall affirm that the confession of every sin, according to the custom of the Church, is impossible, and merely a *human tradition*, which the pious should reject; or that all Christians of both sexes are not bound to observe the same once a year, according to the constitution of the great

⁶ *Conc. Labb.*, t. xi. pars 1; *Conc. Lat.* iv. decret. xxi.

Council of Lateran, and, therefore, that the faithful in Christ are to be persuaded not to confess in Lent ; *let him be accursed.*"⁷

It is interesting for English Christians to know that in the midst of the great spiritual darkness which overwhelmed the Church between the times of the Councils of Lateran and Trent, there were some who held that the "Primitive and Catholic" custom was *confession to God alone*, without the intervention of a poor fellow-sinner calling himself a "priest of God." The following extract from a prayer, found in an ancient roll among the miscellaneous records of the Tower of London, the writing of which belongs to the thirteenth century, and is supposed to have been the property of Edward I.,⁸ will sufficiently speak for itself:—

"Therefore, I pray Thee, Jesu Christ! *hear my confession*, pardon all the wickedness I have done, enable me to make worthy satisfaction, and to do all true penance before death, for Thy name's sake, O Jesu!"⁹

Although there are certain terms in this prayer which no Christian well instructed in "Primitive and Catholic" truth would willingly employ without explanation, there is much in it that is beautiful, spiritual, and true; especially on that important point which inculcates the duty of the penitent *confessing to God alone*, in place of to a fellow-creature, according to the authorized requirements of the Church of Rome, and the unauthorized teaching of the Ritualistic clergy, calling themselves "priests of the Church of England," in the present day.

We must now consider what is the teaching of our "Protestant and Reformed" Church, whose aim has always been to uphold the principles of the "Primitive and Catholic" Church, on this momentous subject.

During the reign of Henry VIII., the only step taken in the way of reformation was the rejection of the Papal supremacy,

⁷ Conc. Trid. *Canon et Decret.*, Sess. XIV. De Pœnit. Sacr. 6 and 8.

⁸ It should be remembered that Edward I., "the greatest of the Plantagenets," did more than any of our sovereigns to resist the pretensions and usurpations of the Church of Rome during the darkness which overspread Christendom in the Middle Ages.

⁹ Bentley's *Excerpta Historica*, p. 408.

which Rome had for so many ages usurped over the Churches of Western Christendom. It is not generally remembered that this action of the Church of England, one of the very few laudable acts of Convocation, was performed in the year 1531,¹ during the primacy of Archbishop Wareham, and before Henry's rupture with the Papacy. The spiritual power then, though with a very bad grace, conceded the title of "Supreme Head" to the Sovereign of England; and virtually consented that the same power which the Pope had hitherto possessed should be henceforth vested in the crown.

On the accession of Edward VI., when the Reformation may be said to have taken the next step, we find the subject of *sacramental confession* thus treated in the first Prayer Book of that reign, A.D. 1549. It begins: "Edward, by the grace of God, King of England, France, and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, and of the Church of England and Ireland, *in earth the Supreme Head.*" The subject of sacramental confession is thus spoken of in the exhortation preceding the Communion service:—

"If there be any of you, whose conscience is troubled and grieved in anything, lacking comfort or counsel, let him come to me, or to some *other discreet and learned priest*, taught in the law of God, and confess and open his sin and grief secretly, that he may receive such ghostly counsel, advice, and comfort, that his conscience may be relieved, and that of us, as of the ministers of God and the Church, he may receive comfort and absolution, to the satisfaction of his mind, and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness: requiring such as shall be satisfied with a general confession, not to be offended with them that do use, to their further satisfying, *the auricular and secret confession to the priest.*"

The reader will observe, that though "auricular and secret confession to the parish priest," or "to some other discreet and learned priest," is permitted, it was no longer compulsory pre-

¹ It is pitiable to read the account of the conduct of the Anglo-Roman clergy at the time when they were compelled to concede to the Crown the title of "Supreme Head," though they endeavoured to qualify their behaviour and to satisfy their consciences by the saving clause, "as far as is allowed by the law of Christ," which, as Bishop Burnet sententiously observes, "the nature of things did require to be supposed."

vions to the reception of the Lord's Supper, as had been the rule in the Roman Church ever since the decree of the fourth Council of Lateran, A.D. 1215. And a further step towards returning to the practice and principles of the "Primitive and Catholic" Church is seen in the rule laid down in the second Prayer Book of Edward, A.D. 1552, wherein the order respecting confession, in one of the exhortations to the Holy Communion, to be said occasionally, "at the discretion of the curate," is thus stated:—

"Because it is requisite that no man should come to the Holy Communion but with a full trust in God's mercy, and with a quiet conscience: therefore, if there be any of you which by the means aforesaid cannot quiet his own conscience, but requireth further comfort or counsel; then let him come to me, or some other discreet and learned *minister of God's Word*, and open his grief, that he may receive such ghostly counsel, advice, and comfort, as his conscience may be relieved; and that *by the ministry of God's Word* he may receive comfort and the benefit of absolution, to the quieting of his conscience and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness."

With some trifling and immaterial differences, the order respecting sacramental confession, as it stood in the second Prayer Book of Edward, is the same as has been retained in our Book of Common Prayer down to the present day.² It will be observed that here "secret" confession is no longer recommended, as in the Prayer Book of 1549; the word "priest" is exchanged for the more "Primitive and Catholic" title of minister; and the penitent henceforth was to look for "comfort and the benefit of *absolution*," not to any fellow-sinner or to any assumption of pretended priestly power, but solely to "the ministry of God's Word"—as the late Bishop Phillpotts justly

² One of many proofs that the Reformed Church of England knows no distinction between clergy and laity in the general confession which each one must make to God, who alone can absolve a sinner, is seen in the mode of printing the "AMENS" in the Book of Common Prayer. When printed in ordinary characters, they are to be pronounced by the minister and those who have repeated the previous words; when in *Italics*, only by the people. Now, in the general confession of sin in the Morning and Evening Service, as well as in the Communion Service, it will be seen that the "Amens" in both instances are printed in the ordinary characters, and not in *Italics*, showing thereby the sense of the Church on this question.

remarked, "Not by the judicial sentence of the priest, but by the *ministry of God's Holy Word*, or an authoritative declaration of God's general promises."³

It is important to notice these differences, however slight they may at first sight appear, simply on account of the abuse which certain clergy do not think it beneath them to make in order to promote the cause they have at heart, upon the principle, we must suppose, that the end sanctifies the means. We have a striking instance of this in Archdeacon Denison's treatment of the subject, to which we have before alluded. In his sermon, preached at Wells Cathedral in 1873, he says, "The Church encourages, directs, *requires* that a man go to a *priest*, 'open his grief,' and *ask* to receive the benefit of absolution." Now there are three mistakes in this short sentence, whereby Archdeacon Denison seeks to impose his theory of sacramental confession on those who are willing to receive it. The Church does not "require," but only *permits*, a person who cannot otherwise quiet his conscience to "open his grief," not "to a priest," but to a "*minister*" of God's word; and so far from "asking to receive the benefit of absolution," evidently from some ideal priest of the archdeacon's imagination, the Church says nothing whatever about "asking," but says, without asking, the penitent may "receive the benefit of absolution *by the ministry of God's holy word*." In short, Archdeacon Denison's mode of arguing this question reminds us of a well-known anecdote once current in Paris of the *French Academy* having sent a copy of a work on Natural History to M. Dupin, in which the *crab* was defined as "*a red fish which walks backwards*." "Gentlemen," said the wit, in returning thanks for the present, "your definition would be admirable, but for the circumstance that the crab is *not* a fish, his colour is *not* red, and he does *not* walk backwards!"

When it is remembered that, according to the order of our Church, a *deacon* is as much a "minister of God's word" as a

³ *Letters to the late Charles Butler*, p. 107, New Edition, 1866,

presbyter or priest, we see the apparent design of the arch-deacon's unfortunate misquotation. And as a further specimen of the Ritualists' skill in controversy on this subject, they have widely disseminated a four-page tract entitled, *Information about Confession*, published by Palmer of Little Queen Street, in which they think to impose upon Protestants by a series of passages from Scripture, with portions *Italicised*, with a view to ensnare their readers. One specimen will suffice. In quoting St. Luke's record of our Lord's cure of the lepers, it is thus given: "They lifted up their voices and said, Jesus, Master, have mercy on us. And when He saw them, He said unto them, *Go, show yourselves unto the priests.*" The writer's meaning being evidently for the purpose of advocating "secret confession to a priest," in order to receive absolution thereby!!!

In confirmation of our contention that the Reformers of the Church of England, when they were delivered from the bondage of that fearful power, which is represented in the Apocalypse as being both "drunken with the blood of the saints," as well as "making the inhabitants of the earth drunk with the wine" of her spiritual enticements,⁴ rejected *sacramental confession*, as a doctrine contrary to the practice and precepts of the "Primitive and Catholic" Church, it should be remembered, that at the time of the Reformation the confessional boxes were removed, by lawful authority, from all the churches in the land; since which period the clergy have received no orders or directions, such as exist in the Roman Church, as to the duty and manner of sacramental confession; that it has been rejected alike by the clergy and laity for the last three centuries; that the Reformers wrote against it; and that the Papists have always denounced the Church of England for her rejection of the system of what is termed "auricular or sacramental confession."

The doctrines taught by our Reformed Church on this subject may be judged by the following passage taken from the *Homily of Repentance*, and which appears to be as applicable

⁴ Rev. xvii. 2, 4.

to our "adversaries" of the Ritualistic order *now* as it was to those of the Papal order *then* :—

"Whereas the *adversaries* go about to wrest this place (St. James' command for mutual confession of faults to one another) for to maintain their *auricular confession* withal, they are greatly deceived themselves, and do shamefully deceive others; for if this text ought to be understood of *auricular confession*, then the priests are as much bound to confess themselves to the lay people, as the lay people are bound to confess themselves to them. And if to pray is to absolve, then the laity by this place hath as great authority to absolve the priests as the priests to absolve the laity."

Cranmer's opinion on the subject is thus expressed :—

"15. Whether a man be bound by authority of this Scripture, *Quorum Remiseritis*, and such like, to confess his secret deadly sins to a priest, if he may have him or no?

"A man is *not bound* by the authority of this Scripture to confess his secret deadly sins to a priest, although he may have him."⁵

In the *Records of the Convocation* of 1562, printed by Strype, Archbishop Parker (the first primate of the Church after the death of "bloody" Queen Mary) has a note to the following effect :—

"What priest or minister soever, under colour hereof, shall practice *auricular confession*, shall be deprived of all his livings, and *deposed from the ministry*."

Anyone wishing to be a thorough master of the subject of "sacramental confession," cannot do better than read Jewel's crushing refutation of the sophistries of the Jesuit Harding as set forth in his masterly *Defence of the Apology of the Church of England*, from which I make the following brief extracts :—

"Three kinds of confession are expressed to us in the Scriptures: the first made secretly unto God alone; the second openly before the whole congregation; the third privately unto our brother. . . . Thus much only we say, that private confession to be made unto the minister is neither commanded by Christ nor necessary to salvation.

⁵ *Questions and Answers concerning the Sacraments, and the Appointment and Power of Bishops and Priests.* By Archbishop Cranmer. Parker Soc. Edit., p. 117. Printed verbatim from the MSS. in the British Museum, Cott. Lib. Cleop. E v. f. 53.

“Theodorus, sometime Archbishop of Canterbury, a Greek born, saith, ‘Some say we are bound to confess our sins only to God, as do the Grecians.’ Whereupon the gloss of Gratian⁶ noteth thus: ‘Among the Grecians confession is not necessary, for that no such tradition ever came amongst them.’

“Do penance, such as is done in the Church, that the Church may pray for you: Job saith, ‘I was not ashamed in the sight of all people to confess my sins:’ therefore God would that Theodosius (being the emperor of the world) should do open penance even in the presence of all the people. This is the confession that St. Augustine speaketh of; not secret, or private, or in the ear; but public, and open, and in the sight and hearing of all the people.

“This, therefore, M. Harding, was no plain dealing, with such sleight to turn public into private, and the open audience of the whole people *into one only man’s secret ear*; and so much to abuse the simplicity of your reader. Certainly these words of St. Augustine, ‘open penance,’ ‘confess openly,’ ‘in the sight of all the people,’ ‘that the whole Church may pray for thee:’ these words, I say, will not easily serve to prove your purpose for private confession.”⁷

I will now give the opinions of some of our bishops in the present time respecting the duty of sacramental confession, as expressed in the debate in Convocation of May 9th, 1873, on the presentation of the petition of 480 “Priests” of the Church of England in favour of the same.

The late Bishop of Winchester (Wilberforce) stated that he had found:—

“Some young men in my own diocese, who have taught what I consider a great error—viz., that no man can lead the highest Christian life unless he is in the habitual practice of confession. This I hold to be a most *mischierous doctrine*, one entirely alien to the whole spirit of the Church of England. I for one, and I believe every one of my right reverend brethren, utterly deprecate such teaching.”

The present Bishop of Winchester (Harold Browne) said:—

“I know of many instances of persons extremely ill qualified to act as confessors being chosen by certain persons, or having propounded themselves

⁶ Decret. Grat. Dec. Sec. Pars, De Pœnit. Dist. 1, can. 90, col. 1718.
Corp. Jur. Canon. Lugd. 1624.

⁷ Jewel’s *Defence of the Apology*, part ii. pp. 351, 3, 61. Parker Soc,

as confessors; and I imagine that your lordships are all cognisant of it also in your own spheres of knowledge. I am sorry to say that I have been cognisant personally of *two or three most grievous results that I can only allude to in a general form*, through young women having chosen young men, by their own free choice, as their confessors."

The present Bishop of Salisbury (Moberly) declared:—

"Habitual confession, which practically meant compulsory confession, was unholy, illegal, and full of mischief."

The late Bishop of London, (Bloomfield,) in his charge of 1842, puts the question upon its proper basis when describing—

"Auricular confession as a practice *utterly unknown to the Primitive Church*, one of the most fearful abuses of that of Rome, and the source of unspeakable abominations."

The present Bishop of Peterborough, (Magee,) in a speech delivered some years ago on *auricular confession in the Church of England*, observes:—

"I maintain that, taking God's place without God's attributes, it is impossible, however prudent the priest may be, *to avoid instilling vice by the confessional*. . . . I denounce, therefore, the system as *an outrage on decency and common sense, as well as on God's word*."

On the quality of the results flowing from the practice of habitual auricular sacramental confession amongst professing Christians, we have a far better testimony than anything that the bishops of our Protestant Church can say on such a subject. For we have the opinions of the bishops of Rome, who are said to speak with "infallible" accuracy, so that none can doubt on this matter at least that they are speaking the truth, and that, be it remembered, where the system of habitual confession has been practised by a set of men specially "educated" for the purpose during the last six centuries, and regulated with all the care that human skill can devise to prevent any of those evils, which, as we see the Bishop of Winchester acknowledges, to have already crept into our Church, when practised by young men and women unprotected by and acting contrary to the laws of God and man. Yet the bishops

of Rome, notwithstanding the many safeguards with which their confessional is surrounded, have acknowledged the frightful results which necessarily must always ensue from the practice of such a system. Thus, *e.g.*, Pope Paul IV. (1556—9) published a bull against the abuses of the confessional, which describes the evil in the following language :—

“Whereas certain ecclesiastics in the kingdom of Spain, and in the cities and dioceses thereof, having the cure of souls, or exercising such cure for others, or otherwise *deputed to hear the confessions of penitents*, have broken out into *such heinous acts of iniquity*, as to abuse the sacrament of penance, *in the very act of hearing the confessions*, not fearing to injure the same sacrament, and Him who instituted it, our Lord God and Saviour Jesus Christ, by enticing and provoking, or trying to entice and provoke, females to immoral acts *at the very time they were making their confessions*.”

Pope Gregory XV. issued the Bull *Universi Domini* (A.D. 1622) on the same subject, as necessary to meet the increasing abuses of the confessional, in which he says :—

“Whoever shall attempt to solicit any to improper acts in the act of sacramental confessional, either before or immediately after, or at the time, or under the pretext of confession, though the confession should not accompany, or without the occasion of confession, *in the confessional*, or in any other place where sacramental confessions are heard, or a place chosen to hear confessions, and pretending there to hear confessions, let them be severely punished.”^s

This is sufficient to show that the frightful immorality in past ages flowing from the system of sacramental confession in the Church of Rome has been admitted by its rulers, who have endeavoured to correct the evil; but with little success, as appears from the admissions of Roman Catholic priests as to what goes on both in England and the Continent at the present day.⁹

^s Dens' *Theologia*, t. vi. ; *De Casibus Reservatis*, No. 216.

⁹ I have neither space nor inclination to record the “unspeakable abominations” of the confessional as existing in the present day, both in England and on the Continent, as acknowledged by Roman priests themselves; but will content myself with mentioning the names of a few works where full information may be obtained on this painful subject. For *Spain*, Blanco White's *Practical and Internal Evidence against Catholicism*, London, 1826; and *A Master Key to Popery*, by D. Antonio Gavin, some years

Although it is too early to test the full result of the confessional as it is being gradually introduced into the Church of England, sufficient has been brought to light, and admitted, as we have seen by the Bishop of Winchester and others, to assure us that the same *quality* of sin has already appeared amongst the advocates of the confessional in the Church of England, as has so long existed in the Church of Rome. Hence we are not surprised to find that the late Mr. Keble, as one of the leaders in the "Oxford movement," when writing "On the evils resulting from the disuse of confession in the English Church," characteristically observes, "*We go on working in the dark*; and in the dark it will be, until *real systematic confession* is revived in our Church."

As Mr. Keble had never been received into the Church of Rome, where "real systematic confession" is the rule, he is scarcely competent to speak on this momentous subject. But we may accept the testimony of one who had been received into the Church of Rome, and who thus speaks of the "gross darkness" which must ever accompany the confessional, whether as allowed in the Church of Rome, or as secretly practised by the unfaithful clergy of the Church of England.

secular priest in the Church of Rome; London, 1725. For *France*, *Confessions of a French Catholic Priest*, edited by S. F. B. Morse, M.A.; New York, 1836. For *Ireland*, *The Development of the Court of Rome in Ireland*, by the Rev. L. Morissy, Parish Priest of Oning, and R.C. Chaplain in his Majesty's prisons in Dublin; Dublin, 1822; and *Auricular Confession and Popish Nunneries*, by William Hogan, formerly Roman Catholic priest; 5th edition, London, Simpkin and Marshall, 1851. For *England*, *A Letter to the Earl of Shrewsbury*, by Pierce Conelly, A.M., formerly Rector of Trinity, Natchez, and late the Earl of Shrewsbury's Domestic Chaplain; 13th edition, London, Hatchards, 1852. In addition, the late Hobart Seymour's work on *The Confessional* affords some very valuable information gathered from the authentic returns of different governments as to the rate of immorality in those countries where the confessional is the rule or the exception. To give one specimen of one species of crime: whereas in *Protestant* England the committals for murder was only 4 in each million of the population, in the *Papal States*, before their absorption into the kingdom of Italy, the number of murders reported by the police rose to the terrible figure of 187 to each million!

“*I have had experience in the confessional from princes downward, and out of it, such as perhaps has fallen to the lot of no other living man ; and my solemn conviction is, that a celibate priesthood, organized like that of Rome, is in irreconcilable hostility with all great human interests.* I have seen clerical inviolability made to mean nothing more than licence and impunity. I have read to the pure and simple-minded Cardinal-Prefect of the Propaganda a narrative, written to a pious lay-friend by a respected Roman priest, of such enormities of lust in his fellow-priests around him, that the reading of them took away my breath,—to be answered ‘*Caro mio, I know it, I know it all and more, and worse than all ; but nothing can be done.*’ I have known a priest, received and honoured at a prince-bishop’s table, when the host knew him to have just seduced a member of his own family. But nothing could be done ! I have been mocked with false promises by dean and bishop in denouncing a young priest, in whose bed-room—and before there had been time for him to dress himself—in broad day, in England, under a convent roof, I had myself found a young nun apparently as much at home as *her confessor* was himself. I have been forced to let pass, without even ecclesiastical rebuke, a priest’s attempt upon the chastity of my own wife, the mother of my children, and to find instead, only sure means taken to prevent the communication to me of any similar attempt in future.”¹

Mr. Keble’s threat of “working in the dark,” in order to introduce the confessional into the Reformed Church of England, is fatally true, we fear, though in a different sense from what the author of the *Christian Year* intended. Alas ! that so immoral and anti-Christian a system in every point of view should have the sanction of his well-known name. And we have a significant instance of what it really means when we find the Ritualists, who are advocating the restoration of the confessional in the Church of England, sending forth such works as *The Priest in Absolution* ;—the *first* part of which was of such a nature that one of our bishops, who had inspected it, described it to the writer of this work as “reeking with obscenity.” And the *second* part seems to have surpassed the *first*, according to a published letter of its author to the Rev. J. C. Chambers, late Vicar of St. Mary’s, Soho, as he states that the book is not

¹ *A Letter to the Earl of Shrewsbury*, by Pierce Connelly, A.M., formerly Rector of Trinity, Natchez, and late the Earl of Shrewsbury’s Domestic Chaplain at Alton Towers ; 13th edition, pp. 17, 21.

publicly sold, but “only delivered to such priests of the English Church as are in the habit of hearing confessions;” from which we must conclude that these “workers in the dark” are so ashamed of “the unspeakable abominations” contained in their books on *Auricular Confession*, that they fear if they were sold openly the authors would render themselves liable to a prosecution by the “Society for the Suppression of Vice.”²

Under the fearful circumstances, then, in which our “Protestant” Church of England is now placed by the action of the treacherous foe within our Zion, I would earnestly counsel every head of a family living in a parish where the clergyman is attempting to introduce the system of *sacramental confession*, for the sake of himself, his children, and the purity of his domestic hearth, to *forbid such an one ever to enter his house*,³ in

² The Ritualistic organs are in the habit of asserting the superior morality of those who believe in the “confessional” at the expense of those who reject it. Thus the *Churchman's Shilling Magazine*, of February, 1875, in its blind hatred of “Luther” and the doctrine of “justification by faith in the merits of Christ,” by a skilful and fraudulent misrepresentation of the *Statistical Society's* publications, endeavours to make it appear that the morality of those countries where the confessional is set up is of a far higher order than those where it is not, specifying “Protestant” Scotland and Roman “Catholic” Spain as cases in point. Had the writer been a little more fair towards the Church of England, of which I suppose he professes to be a member, and referred to Vol. 25 of the *Statistical Society's Transactions*, p. 271, he might have informed his readers that one year's births in Roman Catholic Paris gives this result:—“Total 57,793,” of which number “15,230 were illegitimate;” whereas in *Protestant* London, out of a “total of 65,884,” only “2,423” were of the immoral order. And in that ultra-Roman Catholic city Vienna, where a Protestant was scarcely to be found, the returns for 1851 disclose this appalling fact, that of the total births, amounting to 21,000, *the illegitimate births exceed the legitimate ones by more than 700!* So much for the morality of the “confessional,” and, we may add, of a Ritualistic writer determined to exalt his cause at the expense of truth.

³ A very useful and excellent tract has lately been published by Alden of Oxford, entitled, “A True Narrative of a Real Penitent,” extracted from Père Chiniquy's work, *The Priest, the Woman, and the Confessional*, which is replete with instruction on the evils necessarily connected with the system of auricular confession, whether in the fallen Church of Rome, or

accordance with the Apostolic prohibition, "Receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed. For he that biddeth him God speed is *partaker of his evil deeds*." For the doctrine of *sacramental confession* has neither scriptural nor "Primitive and Catholic" authority in its favour; but is essentially heathenish in its origin, anti-Christian in its practice, and abominable and injurious to every one connected with it in the highest possible degree.

the Reformed Church of England. Père Chiniquy is a faithful witness to this in the former, as the present Bishop of Winchester, by his speech in Convocation two years ago, is in the latter.

CHAPTER XIV.

PRIESTLY ABSOLUTION.

THE theory of those Churchmen who adopt the practice of "auricular confession" to a priest, and of private "absolution" by a priest, is made to rest upon that passage in the Ordination Service of the Book of Common Prayer, which the bishop says when any "receiveth the order of priesthood," and which reads as follows:—

"Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the Imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained. And be thou a faithful dispenser of the Word of God, and of His holy Sacraments. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen."

Dr. Pusey, writing to the *Times*, Nov. 29th, 1866, says: "So long as those words of our Lord, 'Whose sins thou dost forgive,'⁴ &c., are repeated over us when we are ordained, so long will there be confession in the Church of England." But he does not appear to be aware, or else he has studiously con-

⁴ Romanists and Ritualists alike appear to forget that He who said to His chosen apostles, "Whose sins thou dost forgive," &c., said likewise to them, "Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out devils," &c.; thereby proving the miraculous gifts bestowed upon those who possessed power to forgive sins. When any one succeeds in "raising the dead," we may safely promise, with Bishop Jewel, to give over, and accept the uncatholic pretensions of the sacerdotal party throughout the world. It is true that the *Breviary* of the Roman Church, in its service on the "Festival of Stanislaus, bishop and martyr," May 7th, records an instance of "a witness, who had been three years dead," being brought into court to testify on behalf of the bishop, who was falsely accused by the King of Poland; but we can scarcely imagine that any rational being, whether Papist or Protestant, can believe so silly and absurd a legend.

cealed the fact, what it will be my endeavour now to prove :—
1st. That the confessional, as it now exists in the Church of Rome, and as it has been revived to a considerable extent in our Reformed Church by the Ritualists of the present day, is radically different in all points from the system of confession and absolution of the early Church, *i.e.*, of the Church for nearly one thousand years after the promulgation of the Gospel.

2nd. That the words of Christ quoted above, “Receive the Holy Ghost,” &c., were introduced by the Church of Rome into the *post-ordination* part of the service for ordaining Presbyters, in order that they might be able to comply with the decree of the fourth Council of Lateran, (quoted in the previous chapter,) held A.D. 1215, which organized the modern system of the confessional throughout the Roman Catholic world.

3rd. That the Church of England, together with those Churches which have derived their orders from her, is the only Church in the whole world that uses these words as the form of conferring orders, Dr. Reichel has shown in his admirable pamphlet, *Shall we alter the Ordinal?*⁵ as he proves by an amount of evidence which is simply overwhelming, that—

“By no branch of the Eastern Church have the words ‘Receive ye the Holy Ghost,’ &c., ever been thus used. Even the Latin Church, which introduced them, does not use them *to confer orders*, but only *to confer the* (supposed) *power of granting or refusing judicial absolution*. It has been reserved for the Anglican Church to make them the very formula of ordination, and in doing this she stands alone.” (P. iv.)

The vital difference between the system of confessing to God and of obtaining absolution from Him who alone can pardon sinners, as adopted by the Primitive Church, and that practised by the Church of Rome during the last six centuries, and now attempted to be revived among ourselves, may be seen in the following facts.

Amongst the Christians of the first three centuries, there cannot be found amongst the numerous writings of the fathers

⁵ See also the late Rev. M. Hobart Seymour’s invaluable work on *The Confessional*.

of that period the slightest sign that they had ever heard of such a thing as *confession to the ear of a priest, and absolution given by a priest*. In the fourth century, after the great influx of the heathen on the forced union of the Church and State by the Emperor Constantine, it appears to have been usual for persons who felt their conscience burdened with some weighty sin, such as was the case in dealing with "the lapsed" of the preceding century, to confess this to the clergy, their confessions being, however, published to the congregation, in order that their prayers might be obtained for the penitent, the absolution of the Church was given in a precatory form to God, and the erring brother was received back again into communion with the faithful.

As early as the third century these public confessions had become inconvenient on account of the nature of the offences, so that in some of the largest churches "Penitentiary Presbyters," as they were termed, were appointed in course of time to receive these confessions *in private*, and only when considered suitable were they made *public* to the congregation. Towards the close of the fourth century, during the episcopate of Nectarius, A.D. 390, the immediate predecessor of the celebrated Chrysostom, a certain lady of rank, after having made a private confession to her minister, fell a victim to the arts of the confessor, and, horrible to relate, the flagitious crime was committed in the church itself. This circumstance, which is fully recorded by the two ecclesiastical historians, Socrates,⁶ who says he received the account from Eudæmon, the presbyter, who advised Bishop Nectarius how to act in the emergency, and also by Sozomen, who adds that the bishops of other churches followed Nectarius' example—caused such commotion that Nectarius, in order to appease the tumult, deprived the offending confessor of his office, abolished the penitentiary presbytership and the custom of privately confessing, and issued a decree on the subject; at the same time leaving all free to partake of the Lord's Supper

⁶ Socrates, *Eccles. Hist.*, lib. v. cap. 19; Sozom., *Eccles. Hist.*, lib. vii. cap. 16.

according to the dictates of their conscience. This, doubtless, will account for the strong language of Chrysostom, as we have seen in the preceding chapter, against the sinful practice of *auricular confession* to a fellow-sinner.

Notwithstanding this terrible exposure of the evils attendant upon voluntary private confession, within about half-a-century later Pope Leo I., (A.D. 440—460,) being greatly discontented with the common practice in that age of *public confession* before the congregation, and foreseeing with the practised eye of a worldly statesman what a tremendous power it would gradually become in the hands of ungodly men who had no fear of God before their eyes, skilfully commenced his operations by addressing a letter to the Bishops of Campania in the immediate neighbourhood of Rome, directing that for the future such confessions should be no longer published, as he writes :—

“Lest many should be kept aloof from the remedies of penitence either by shame, or by the fear of disclosing to their enemies facts which might bring them under the stroke of the laws. For that confession is sufficient, which is made first to God, *and then also to the priest, who approaches God in prayer for the transgression of the penitent.*”⁷

Although this order of Pope Leo to the small number of Churches which then owned his supremacy struck a blow at the previous system of penitential discipline which had ruled in the Church of the third and fourth centuries, for if confession to a priest and his intercession with God on behalf of the penitent was sufficient, the prayers of the congregation, and the absolution of the Church previous to readmission to communion, was no longer required ; it is worthy of note that there is no sign of anything like “priestly absolution,” such as now exists in the Church of Rome, in the direction which Pope Leo gave to the neighbouring Churches of the Campagna. For his direction only refers to those who had fallen into notorious sin, and who had subsequently become penitent, that they should first make their

⁷ Leo *Epist.* 136 *ad Episcop. Campanos*. Dr. Reichel says that this epistle is not found in the Decretal Epistles collected by Harduin in his edition of the *Concilia* ; though it is found in Quesnel’s edition of Pope Leo’s Letters.

confession to God, and after that to the priest, who would aid them by his prayers to the throne of grace on their behalf; but as for presuming to think that it was in the power of any priest, whether pope, patriarch, archbishop, bishop, or presbyter, such blasphemy had never entered the head of any mortal in that comparatively early age of the Church. And this is confirmed by the well-known fact that neither in the *Sacramentary* of Pope Leo I., nor in those of his successors, Gelasius (A.D. 492—496) and Gregory I., (A.D. 590—604,) which are known to be the oldest records existing of the *Liturgy* and *Rites of the Church of Rome*, is there to be found *any form of absolution at all*, which proves that up to the commencement of the seventh century the Church knew nothing of universal compulsory sacramental confession to the ear of a fellow-sinner, and absolution granted at the will and option of a priest.

The late Professor Blunt of Cambridge justly remarks that “the *exomologesis*, or confession, was evidently a *public* act;” and doubts “whether any passage can be produced from the early fathers which does not admit of *public confession* in the church, and in general which does not bear this meaning evidently on the face of it, except in cases of sickness.”⁸ And so the Rev. W. J. E. Bennett, now Vicar of Rome, in his earlier and more enlightened days, taught on this subject, the exact converse of his present practice, as follows:—

“The whole dispute as to the antiquity of confession to the priest will turn upon this point—whether the confession was private or public. All the Romanist writers, in advocating their private auricular confession, ground their arguments upon the ancient *exomologesis*, which we all allow to have been the custom of the Church; but then we assert in contradiction to them, that this *exomologesis* was always a public matter of Church discipline, and did not regard any secret communications of sins to a private priest.”⁹

The most ancient form of absolution, which had the sanction of the early Church, and which may possibly be dated in the third century, is that contained in the *Apostolical Constitutions*,

⁸ Blunt, *On the Early Fathers*, pp. 50, 51.

⁹ Bennet, *On the Distinctive Errors of Romanism*, p. 174.

which shows how entirely "priestly absolution" was unknown in those days, and that it rested solely with Him who alone can hear and answer prayer. The precatory form reads as follows :—

"Almighty and everlasting God, &c.—O Thou, who desirest not the death of a sinner, but rather that he should turn from his evil way and live, *look graciously upon these Thy servants*, who here bow themselves before Thee in humiliation and repentance.—Thou, who didst receive with a fatherly compassion Thy prodigal son—receive in like manner, we humbly beseech Thee, the supplication of those who now turn to Thee with tears of repentance, for there is none who sinneth not against Thee, and in Thy sight; and if Thou, Lord, should be extreme to mark what is done amiss, O Lord, who may abide with Thee? But there is mercy with Thee. *Restore these to the bosom of Thy Holy Church*, and to the place and station which they before held in it, through Jesus Christ our Saviour, by whom, in the Holy Ghost, be all honour and adoration ascribed to Thee, world without end. Amen."

The language in "the Liturgy of St. James" is of exactly a similar nature, and affords us a sufficient specimen of the form of absolution, which was used by the Church in receiving penitent sinners who confessed their faults, for the first twelve centuries of the Christian era. *It is simply a prayer to God* that He would pardon the repentant sinner. There is no assumption of any mysterious or supernatural power in the minister; there is not a shadow of the modern procedure which some of our clergy are striving so earnestly to introduce into our Church; there is nothing approaching to the sacerdotal or priestly absolution of the present day—nothing of the "*Ego te absolvo*." The only *words of absolution* were a prayer that God would forgive the penitent. The only *act of absolution* was the receiving the penitent to the Holy Communion.

Hence our Church in the service for "The Visitation of the Sick," *after* the sick man has made a special confession of any sins which may have troubled his conscience, and the minister has pronounced in the name of the Church the formula "I absolve thee," and then only if the sick person "humbly and heartily desire it," goes on to teach her children to pray for God's forgiveness, which is the only thing worth seeking, and the only thing necessary for all men to have, in these impressive words :—

“O most merciful God, who according to the multitude of Thy mercies, dost so put away the sins of those who truly repent, that Thou rememberest no more; open Thine eye of mercy upon this Thy servant, who most earnestly desireth pardon and forgiveness,” &c. &c.

The Rev. W. Palmer, a high authority on such matters, admits that—

“This prayer is, in fact, *the original absolution*, which has been given to dying penitents for more than thirteen hundred years in the Western Churches. This ancient absolution, or reconciliation of a penitent near death, is not only found in the old formularies of the English Church, where it was long used before the preceding indicative form was introduced, but in the sacramentary of Gelasius, A.D. 494, and for many centuries was commonly used in the Churches of the West.”¹

This much is evident from a review of what has been adduced, that the idea and form of absolution in the Primitive Church was simply prayer that God would Himself pardon and forgive the penitent. Thus, in the Sacramentary of Pope Gelasius, (A.D. 492—6,) we have the form of absolution then in use expressed in these words:—

“O Lord, we beseech Thee, that Thy mercy may prevent this Thy servant, and absolve him from all his sins, through the Lord,” &c.

There are several of the Sacramentaries, Penitentials, and other Rituals in use among the various Churches of the West, which were collected and published by Morinus, in the seventeenth century, in his valuable treatise, *De Ordinationibus*, from which we may gather how many ages had elapsed before any Church had adopted the present modern practice of “priestly absolution” being given to the penitent, or any other sinner. The Sacramentary of Gelasius, which has just been quoted, belongs to the fifth century; and three centuries later we find the mode of absolution still in the precatory form to God. Thus in a Sacramentary of the eighth century, which Morinus terms *Antiquus Penitentialis Romanus ab Halitgaro*, it is thus expressed:—

“O holy Lord, Almighty Father, everlasting God, who, through Thy Son Jesus Christ, hast condescended to heal our wounds, we, Thy humble priests,

¹ Palmer's *Origines Liturgicæ*, p. 46.

suppliantly pray Thee and beseech Thee that Thou wilt incline the ear of Thy compassion to our prayers, and remit all his transgressions, and forgive all his sins, and grant to this Thy servant pardon instead of punishment, joy instead of mourning, and life instead of death, through the Lord.”²

As late as the tenth century the form of absolution remained unchanged, as we gather from the following, taken from the *Codex Siculus* of Cardinal Barbarini, which belongs to that date :—

“May Christ, the Son of God, who knows thy frailty, have merey on thee, and remit all thy sins which thou has committed from thy infancy unto this day, past, present, future, whatever thou hast done, knowingly or ignorantly, by thought, word, or deed. May He deliver thee from all evil, preserve thee unto all good, and bring thee to everlasting life. Amen.”³

Another Penitential, described by Morinus as belonging to the eleventh century, (the exact date of which is said to be A.D. 1070, just four years after the Norman conquest,) exhibits the first beginning of a change which culminated two centuries later in the Lateran decree and the daring claims of “priestly absolution,” as enunciated by the modern Church of Rome. For it is expressed in the following terms :—

“May the Lord God Almighty, who gave to His holy apostles the power of binding and loosing, Himself absolve thee of all thy sins ; and *so far as is permitted to my frailty, be thou absolved before the face of Him* who liveth and reigneth for ever and ever.”⁴

As late as the thirteenth century we have evidence of opposition to the then recently introduced system of that form of “priestly absolution,” which has been authoritatively used in the Church of Rome ever since, and which the Ritualists are endeavouring to force upon the Church of England at the present time. Archbishop Usher, in his grand work in reply to the false and uncatholic nature of the doctrines of the Church of Rome, says :—

“In the days of Thomas Aquinas there arose a learned man among the Papists themselves, who found fault with that indicative form of absolution

² Morinus, *De Ordin.*, p. 7.

³ Ibid., Idem, p. 25.

⁴ Ibid., Idem, p. 602.

then used by the priest, '*I absolve thee from all thy sins,*' and would have it delivered by way of deprecation; alleging that this was not only the opinion of Gulielmus Parisiensis and Hugo Cardinalis, but also that thirty years were scarce passed since all did use this form only, '*Almighty God give unto thee absolution and forgiveness.*' This only will I add, that as well in the ancient rituals in the new pontifical of the Church of Rome, as in the present practice of the Greek Church, I find the absolution expressed in the third person *as attributed wholly* to God; and not in the first, as if it came from the priest himself. . . . Alexander of Hales, and Bonaventure, in the form of absolution used in their time, (thirteenth century,) observe that 'prayer was premised in the optative, and absolution adjoined afterward in the indicative mode.'" ⁵

It is interesting and very instructive to remark in the ancient service-books of the Western Churches the gradual and timorous changes, by which the precatory form which marked the early rite passed into the indicative or judicial form. The former began to be disused in the thirteenth century, and the latter is said to have been first enjoined by the Synod of London, held under Cardinal Ottoboni, A.D. 1268. And from that time to the present day amongst English Papists, as Dr. Newman in his *Apologia* informs us, the form of absolution has been as follows:—

"May our Lord Jesus Christ absolve thee. And by His authority I absolve thee from every bond of excommunication and interdict, so far as is in my power, and so far as you need. *Therefore, I absolve thee from thy sins, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.*"

Dr. Newman has taken the opportunity of affixing to the above form a very singular defence of his famous Tract XC., which may be noticed for the purpose of pointing out the grave mistake he has made in his interpretation of what the early Church really taught on the subject of absolution. He writes:—

"I challenge, in the sight of all England, Evangelical clergymen generally to put on paper an interpretation of this form of words, consistent with their sentiments, which shall be *less forced* than the most objectionable of the interpretations which Tract XC. puts on any passage in the Articles."⁶

⁵ Usher's *Answer to a Jesuit*, ch. v., *On the Priest's power to forgive sins.*

⁶ Newman's *Apologia*, p. 171.

Any one wishing to see this bold challenge taken up, and completely refuted, need only refer to the late Hobart Seymour's valuable work on *The Confessional*; but it will be sufficient for our purpose if we point out that the distinction between ancient Catholic teaching and that of the modern Church of Rome on the doctrine of "absolution," is that with the former, it was *the forgiveness of God*, sought for by the prayers of the Church on behalf of the penitent; with the latter, it is by the power claimed for the priest standing in the place of God, and pronouncing the words over the penitent, after auricular confession, *Ego te absolvo*,—"I absolve thee from thy sins." And the difference between the teaching of the Church of England and Rome on the same subject is—that whereas the former uses the same words only in a *declaratory* sense, (just as the Jewish priest⁷ of old declared the leper to be cleansed, when he saw that it was done,) as is proved by the prayer to God for pardon *after* the minister has pronounced those words to any sick person, "troubled in his conscience, who shall humbly and heartily desire" such comfort, but to none other, the Church of Rome pronounces absolutely, that every sinner who shall confess his sins to a priest, can obtain human absolution thereby, and anathematizes all who shall consider the formula, "I absolve thee," merely as a ministerial or declaratory act. The Council of Trent speaks as follows on this point:—

"Whosoever shall affirm, that the priest's sacramental absolution is not a judicial act, *but only a ministry to pronounce and declare that the sins of the party confessing are forgiven*, . . . let him be accursed."⁸

"The voice of the priest, legitimately pardoning our sins, is to be heard *even as of Christ the Lord*, who said to the paralytic, 'Son, be of good cheer: thy sins are forgiven thee.' . . . The absolution pronounced in the words of the priest, signifies the remission of sins, which it accomplishes in the soul. . . . Unlike the authority given to the priests of the old law, *merely to declare the leper cleansed from his leprosy*, the power of the priests in the Church, is not simply to declare a person absolved from his sins, but, as the ministers of God, they really absolve."⁹

⁷ Lev. xiv. 1—7.

⁸ Council of Trent, Sess. xiv. 9.

⁹ Catechism of the Council of Trent, ch. v. 2, 10, 11, 16.

(1.) Whether the teaching of the Church of England or that of Rome is most in accordance with that of the Primitive Christians, let the following extracts from the writings of some of the early fathers decide. We have seen in the preceding chapter that Clement of Rome declares the uselessness of confession to any but God alone; and his namesake, of Alexandria, as positively declares against the need of "priestly absolution," by teaching that:—

"He alone can absolve from sins who died for our sins."¹

(2.) In the same sense Irenæus asserts:—

"If none can forgive sins but God alone, and our Lord forgave them, and cured men, it is manifest that He was the word of God, made the Son of man."²

(3.) And Tertullian says:—

"When the Jews, only seeing Christ's humanity, and not being yet certain of His deity, deservedly reasoned that none could forgive sins but God, . . . He, by declaring that 'the Son of man hath authority to forgive sins,' would have them know that He was that only Son of man prophesied in Daniel, who received power of judging, and thereby also of forgiving sins."³

(4.) And so, in a subsequent age, taught Hilary, Bishop of Poitiers:—

"None can forgive sins but God alone: and, therefore, He who absolves is God, because no one can absolve but God."⁴

(5.) St. Augustine teaches in the same strain against priestly assumption:—

"The Lord was to give unto men the Holy Ghost, by which He meant, that through the Holy Ghost Himself sins should be forgiven to men, and not by any human merits. For what art thou, O man, but a sick invalid, who needest healing? Wilt thou be physician to me? Seek the good Physician together with me."⁵

¹ Clem. Alex., *Pædog.*, lib. i. cap. 8.

² Iren., *Adv. Hæc.*, lib. v. cap. 17, § 3.

³ Tertull., *Adv. Marc.*, lib. iv. cap. 10.

⁴ Hilary, *Com. in Matt.*, cap. viii.

⁵ St. August., *Hom.* 38.

To come down to the time of the Reformation, Cranmer expresses his opinion on the subject of "absolution," a few years after the Church of England had separated from her fallen sister of Rome. In a series of *Questions and Answers concerning the Sacraments and the Appointment and Power of Bishops and Priests*, he thus discusses the question :—

"Whether a man be bound by authority of this Scripture, *Quorum remiseritis*, and such like, to confess his secret deadly sins to a priest, if he may have him or no?"

"A man is not bound by the authority of this Scripture, *Quorum remiseritis*, and such like, to confess his deadly sins to a priest, although he may have him."

"*T. Cantuarien*.—This is mine opinion and sentence at this present."⁶

Although it is quite certain that the Primitive Christians knew nothing whatever of the power of "priestly absolution" exercised in the way in which we have seen the Church of Rome claims to do on behalf of her priesthood, we have to meet the difficulty respecting the existence of the formula *Ego te absolvo*, "I absolve thee," being retained in the ordination service of the Church of England, such as we meet with in the challenge of Dr. Newman, and the language of Dr. Pusey, which we have already quoted at the commencement of this present chapter. But they both appear to be unconscious of the undoubted fact that the words of our Lord, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost, whose soever sins ye remit," &c., which accompany the commission to absolve, *never had any part in the ordination of the ministers of any one branch of the Church of Christ for the first 1200 years of the Christian era*. And thus as no ritual during twelve centuries in either the East or West of Christendom, contains the formula of any sacerdotal absolution, so no ordinal, or ordination service during the same period confers the power to one sinner of absolving another.

The testimony of Morinus on this point is so very precise that we cannot avoid giving it in his own words. Morinus was a very learned member of the Church of Rome, and on this matter

⁶ Cranmer's Works, Park. Soc. edit., p. 117. This work is proved to have been written between Sept. 17 and Dec. 29, 1540.

of ordination no one has shown a more perfect mastery of the subject than himself. He says:—

“Let us enquire whether that last laying on of hands, with which is joined the formula, “Receive ye the Holy Ghost, whose soever sins ye remit,” &c., be indeed the true and ancient form of conferring the priesthood, or a part of that form which the Apostles and ancients have handed down to us. That whole rite, whether as to matter, or form, or details, was *unknown in the Church of God for twelve hundred years*. No ritual before this date commemorates it, although they are copious, and describe with minuteness all the ceremonies of small moment. Even some rituals of a far more recent date, and diffuse in themselves, omit it.”⁷

Jacobus Goar, a Dominican friar of the seventeenth century at Paris, has investigated the same subject among the Eastern Churches in a like exhaustive way as Morinus has done in the West; and with precisely similar results. His *Euchologium* contains a large number and variety of the forms of absolving the confessed and repentant sinner; and they all present the same leading characteristic, viz., of prayer to God, that He would Himself forgive the confessing penitent, and never in a single instance dealing with forgiveness as in any way belonging to the office of the Christian ministry. One example of the forms of absolution in the Churches of the East will suffice:—

“O Sovereign Lord God! who, by Thy sufferings, hast broken every chain of our sins, and didst breathe upon the face of Thine Apostles, saying, ‘Receive ye the Holy Ghost, whose soever sins ye remit they are remitted,’ &c.; Thou, O Lord, through Thine Apostles, didst grant to the ministers of Thy Holy Church the power of remitting sins, and of binding and loosing every bond of iniquity: we beseech Thee now for our brother before Thee, extend Thy compassion to him, and *loose his chains*; and whatsoever, from ignorance or inadvertence, he has committed, *do Thou*, O Lord, good and merciful, *forgive*.⁸

It will be still more interesting for us as English Christians to see the form of absolution adopted in this country in the purer days of the Anglo-Saxon Church, before being corrupted by her unhappy connection with the Church of Rome. We select two, both given in Morinus’ work, one from the Peniten-

⁷ Morinus, *De Ordinatio*, p. 3.

⁸ Goar’s *Euchologium*, p. 662.

tiary of Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury, A.D. 670 ; and the other from that of Egbert, Archbishop of York, A.D. 731, about sixty years later. The former reads thus :—

“ Christ, the Son of God, have compassion on you, and grant you to perform acceptable penitence. May he give you, moreover, a sound faith, a lively hope, a perfect charity, true humility and wisdom, sobriety and patience, perseverance in good works, and a happy end. God, of His abundant mercy, pardon you all your sins, present, past, and future. May His Holy Spirit enlighten you. May He guide all your senses, inspire you with holy thoughts and purposes, save your soul, and finally bring you to life eternal.”

The form of absolution in the province of York ran as follows :—

“ Almighty and everlasting God, release, I beseech Thee, this Thy servant from the sin which he hath here confessed before Thee, that the guilt of his conscience may call no longer for punishment than the pitifulness of Thy mercy may plead for his forgiveness. Through Jesus Christ.”

To which may be added a very beautiful prayer from the same office book of the eighth century, so well known to us by its retention in the Communion Service of the Book of Common Prayer in the present day :—

“ O Lord, we beseech Thee, mercifully hear our prayers, and spare all those who confess their sins unto Thee ; that they, whose consciences by sin are accused, *by Thy merciful pardon may be absolved* ; through Christ our Lord. Amen.”

Such are the several forms of absolution which were in use in the Church of England twelve centuries ago.⁹ There is not in

⁹ It may be well to mention that the liturgy known as “ the Salisbury use,” *in usum sarum*, which some unquiet spirits of our Church are unhappily attempting to revive in the present day, is of foreign extraction, and of a modern date compared with those ancient services given in the text. It was introduced into England by the Normans, possibly as early as the twelfth century ; became interpolated, and subsequently enlarged ; and in its present state was used not quite three centuries ; thus claiming an existence of not so long a duration as our Reformed Church’s Book of Common Prayer. Nevertheless, a pretended monk of the name “ Lyne,” calling himself by the high-sounding title of “ Father Ignatius,” once a deacon of the Church of England, had the impudence to declare in a lecture at the Marylebone Institution, in reply to the just stricture of M. Capel on the “ organized dishonesty ” of Ritualism, that “ The manuals of the Church of England are

any one of them a trace of that sacerdotal imposition, so evil a sign of modern times, under colour of which the Ritualist pronounces his *Ego te absolvo*, as if he were in the place of God Himself. They are, as we see, simply forms of prayer that God, not the priest, but God, to whom alone the penitent has made his confession, would accept his penitence, pardon his sins, and absolve him from their guilt.

Let us never forget that in all these early Penitentiaries which have been handed down to us, confession of sin is invariably made to God, and not to man. There is no instance in all Scripture, except that of Judas Iscariot, after betraying His Master for thirty pieces of silver, of a confession to the priests of any Church.

The true penitent can only find comfort in the daily confession of his sins to that Almighty Being, who alone can hear the cry and pardon the sin. It is only the man that has tried and experienced it, who can conceive the amazing comfort and something of that inward peace which passeth all understanding that he finds who habitually kneels before the mercy seat, and realizes something of what is so beautifully expressed in one of our well-known hymns:—

the *Sarum Missal* and *Breviary*. These are more Ritualistic than Rome herself, and were only taken away by Henry VIII. I see so much good in Rome, that I want the Church of England to have some of it. . . If I looked on the Church of England as represented in the Prayer Book, I would not remain in her; but I go to the ante-Reformation period, before the Church was gagged by the Act of Supremacy. Our duty is to undo the evil of the sixteenth century." (*Daily Telegraph*, May 27, 1872.) Can we feel surprised that not one English bishop could be found so forgetful of his duty, as to give "priest's orders" to so vain and silly a pretender as this disloyal young Roman ape "Deacon" Lyne has proved himself to be? His insane hatred of the Reformation is only to be equalled by his more honest Popish brother, the author of a Roman work, entitled *My Clerical Friends*, who writes with a similar apprehension of truth to that of "Father Ignatius," as follows:—"There is not an error in religion, not an evil principle in social or political science, for which modern society is not entitled to reproach the *Satanical fraud*, which its contented victims still call the *Reformation*."

Just as I am, without one plea,
But that Thy blood was shed for me,
And that Thou bidd'st me come to Thee,
O Lamb of God, I come!

Just as I am, Thou wilt receive,
Wilt welcome, pardon, cleanse, relieve,
Because Thy promise I believe,
O Lamb of God, I come!

and there, where is no eye but that of the omnipresent God to witness the falling tear, and no ear to hear the cry of the penitent but His whose ears are ever open to the prayer of His people, and thus unburdening the sorrows of his aching heart, pouring out, as it were, his whole soul, to experience with the Psalmist of old, "the blessedness of the man whose transgression is forgiven, and whose sin is covered, and unto whom the Lord imputeth no sin."¹

¹ Ps. xxxii. 1, 2.

CHAPTER XV.

PRAYER FOR THE DEAD.

PRAYER for the dead presupposes *purgatory*, was the argument of Dr. Harding, in his celebrated controversy with Bishop Jewel three centuries ago. A similar admission is made by another Roman controversialist, that "the custom of praying for the dead evidently presupposes the belief of a middle place between heaven and hell; *that is, purgatory.*"² And a third, the well-known Dr. Miller, says:—

"There is an inseparable connexion between the practice of praying for the dead, and the belief of *an intermediate state of souls*; since it is evidently needless to pray for the saints in heaven, and useless to pray for the reprobates in hell."³

It is well that we should understand the doctrine of the Church of Rome on this subject, that there is no distinction between the doctrine of "prayer for the dead" and that of "purgatory;" as there is no doubt but that the former is now adopted by many of the Ritualistic clergy in the present day, as the precursor, we must suppose, for the full-blown advocacy of the latter, as soon as any clergyman perceives that his people are able to bear it.

Thus Mr. Bennett, of Frome, tells us that—

"The souls of the departed abiding in their place of rest may be the subjects of prayer to those who are still alive upon the earth," because "the souls that are departed are not in their perfection."⁴

And Dr. Littledale, in the same work, teaches that—

² Dr. Butler's *Truths of the Catholic Church*, vol. ii. p. 242.

³ Dr. Miller's *End of Controversy*, Letter iv. p. 368.

⁴ *Church's Broken Unity in the Church and World*, by the Rev. W. J. E. Bennett, p. 122.

“The best and holiest men (and much more the average believers) leave this world bearing the stains of earthly sin and error, which must be cleansed somewhere before they can be fitted for heaven.”⁵

And a writer in the *Guardian*, under the signature of “W. W. English,” contends very warmly in favour of “prayer for the dead” being the doctrine of the Reformed Church of England—speaks of the “loose and unscriptural teaching of the homily about going straight to heaven or hell”—admits that the present Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol have pronounced against the doctrine, but sets off against their judgment the opinion of Archbishop Usher and other bishops, whom he names, in its favour, and consequently more worthy of attention, and finishes his dissertation by saying, “In regard to *Scripture*, 2 Maccab. xii. 41—45 contains a distinct account of prayer for the dead; 2 Tim. i. 16—18 contains St. Paul’s prayer for his dead friend Onesiphorus, according to some of the aforementioned bishops.”⁶

⁵ *Prayers for the Dead in Church and the World*, by Dr. Littledale, p. 2.

⁶ *Guardian*, Feb. 8, 1871. The late Archdeacon Freeman, whose sudden death occurred subsequent to the writing of this *Essay*, in the same number of the *Guardian* justly remarks, that “It has over and over again been proved that the Church for two hundred years knew nothing, or certainly said nothing, of prayers for the departed. Mr. Gutch and the translator of the Sarum Missal have undertaken respectively the defence of *prayers for the dead*, and of elevation in order to divine worship. They base themselves on the Liturgies and St. Augustine. *But the defence breaks down miserably in both cases.*” As the Ritualists base their assumption of the Church of England sanctioning “prayers for the dead” upon Sir H. Jenner Just’s decision in *Brecks v. Woolfrey*, that an inscription for a tombstone in Carisbrook Churchyard, begging prayers for the soul of the deceased, was lawful—forgetting that it is one thing to allow such an inscription in a churchyard, and another to allow prayers for the dead to be used during the services of the Church—it is sufficient for every Catholic Churchman to know that prayers for the dead were included in the first Prayer Book of Edward VI., 1549, and are excluded from our present Book of 1662. Hence upon the principle—now firmly established in the case of *Westerton v. Liddell*, by which “the mixed chalice” was proved illegal—that no omission from or addition to the prescribed form can be permitted, “prayer for the dead” is as clearly illegal in the Reformed Church of England at the present time, as it was unknown and unpractised by the Primitive Christians in the days of the Apostles.

It may be well for us to examine some of these statements, and see how far they agree with the doctrine which they are intended to support. Reversing the order of Mr. English's arguments, we may observe, in the first place, that his reference to the Book of Maccabees as "Scripture" authority on the subject is simply beside the mark, inasmuch as Maccabees is not "Scripture," but one of the Books of the Apocrypha, which the Church of England "doth not apply to establish any doctrine," (Article VI. ;) and as for the reference to the case of *Onesiphorus*, mentioned in 2 Tim. i. 16—18, it only shows to what straits the advocates of the doctrine are put, if this be the only instance in Scripture which supports, as they vainly imagine, their untenable and uncatholic theory. For this rests upon the supposition that Onesiphorus was dead when St. Paul wrote the Epistle to Timothy, of which there is not a shadow of proof either offered or to be found that such was the case; and even if it were so, the language of the Apostle shows, that he is only praying that Onesiphorus might "find mercy at the great day" of recompence, as the Liturgy of our Church and all ancient Liturgies express it, "for deliverance in the hour of death, and at the day of judgment;" which is a very different thing from prayers made for souls supposed to be in purgatory, which, if they can do them any good at all, must be supposed to do so *before that day*.

The reference to Archbishop Usher supporting the doctrine of "prayer for the dead" is another of those mistakes which controversialists are apt to make who are not very well posted on the subject on which they write; as may be seen by the following passage taken from his great work on the subject, and in which he shews that the meaning of "prayers for the dead" was of a very different nature from the Roman and modern teaching on that subject:—

"For the Church, in her commemorations and prayers for the dead, had no relation at all unto those that had led their lives dissolutely, as appeareth plainly, both by the author of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, and by divers other evidences before alleged; but unto those that did end their lives in such a godly manner as gave pregnant hope unto the living that their souls were at rest with God; and *to such as these alone* did it wish

the accomplishment of that which remained of their redemption: to wit, their public justification and solemn acquittal at the last day, and their perfect consummation of bliss, both in body and soul, in the kingdom of heaven for ever after. Not that the event of these things was conceived to be any ways doubtful, (for we have been told that things may be prayed for, the event whereof is known to be most certain;) but because the commemoration thereof was thought to serve for special use, not only in regard of the manifestation of the affection of the living towards the dead, but also in respect of the consolation and instruction which the living might receive thereby.”⁷

As Mr. English quotes the *Apocrypha*, which the Church rejects as having any authority on doctrinal points, in place of Scripture, in order to support his own views, it was natural that he should talk about “the loose and unscriptural teaching of the homily” on the same subject, since the Church expressly declares that “the second Book of Homilies doth contain a *godly and wholesome doctrine*, and necessary for these times.” (Article XXXV.) Whether the charge of “loose and unscriptural” is really applicable, let the following quotation from the second Book of Homilies decide:—

“Now to entreat of that question, whether we ought to pray for them that are departed out of this world, or no. Wherein, *if we will cleave only unto the word of God*, then must we needs grant that *we have no commandment* so to do. For the Scripture doth acknowledge but two places after this life: the one proper to the elect and blessed of God, the other to the reprobate and damned souls; as may be well gathered by the parable of Lazarus and the rich man, (Luke xvi. 19—26;) which place St. Augustine expounding saith in this wise, ‘That which Abraham speaketh unto the rich man in Luke’s gospel, namely, that the just cannot go into those places where the wicked are tormented, what other things doth it signify but only this, that the just, by reason of God’s judgment, which may not be revoked, can show no deed of mercy in helping them which after this life are cast into prison, until they pay the uttermost farthing?’ These words, as they confound the opinion of helping the dead by prayer, so they do clean confute and take away the vain error of *purgatory*, which is grounded upon this saying of the Gospel, ‘*Thou shalt not depart thence until thou hast paid the uttermost farthing.*’ (Matt. v. 26.) Now doth St. Augustine say, that those men which are cast into prison after this life, on that condi-

⁷ Usher’s *Answer to a Jesuit’s Challenge—Of Prayer for the Dead*, ch. vii.

tion, may in no wise be holpen, though we would help them never so much. And why? Because the sentence of God is unchangeable, and cannot be revoked again. Therefore let us not deceive ourselves, thinking that either we may help other, or other may help us, by their good and charitable prayers in time to come. For as the preacher saith, *When the tree falleth, whether it be toward the south or toward the north, in what place soever the tree falleth, there it lieth*, (Eccles. xi. 3 :) meaning thereby, that every mortal man doth, either in the state of salvation or damnation, according as the words of the Evangelist John do also plainly import, saying, *'He that believeth on the Son of God hath eternal life; but he that believeth not on the Son shall never see life, but the wrath of God abideth upon him.'* (John iii. 36.) St. Augustine doth only acknowledge two places after this life, heaven and hell. As for the third place, he doth plainly deny there is any such to be found in all Scripture. . . . The only *purgatory* wherein we must trust to be saved, is the death and blood of Christ; which, we apprehend, with a true and steadfast faith, it purgeth and cleanseth us from all our sins, even as well as if He were now hanging upon the cross. This, then, is that *purgatory*, wherein all Christian men put their whole trust and confidence, nothing doubting; but if they truly repent them of their sins, and die in perfect faith, that they shall forthwith pass from death to life. Let us not, therefore, dream either of *purgatory* or of *prayer for the souls of them that be dead*." (Hom. XIX., Pt. iii.)

The most daring defence of the lawfulness of "praying for the dead" which the Ritualists have put forth is to be found in a work entitled *Catechism on the Office of Holy Communion*, compiled by "a Committee of Clergy." At p. 9 of this work the doctrine is thus taught:—"Q. What follows the Oblation? A. The prayer for the Church Militant.—What does Church Militant mean? All Christians who are still alive and fighting against sin in the world.—*Do we pray for any others in this prayer? Yes, for all those who have died in the faith and fear of God.*—To what part of the Church do they belong? To the Church Triumphant.—Why do we pray for them? Because their happiness is not yet complete, and we ask God to hasten the time when they shall enjoy all the blessings of heaven." Now, in reply to this monstrous false teaching, it will be sufficient to quote the words of the "Prayer for the Church Militant" alluded to above, which reads in our Book of Common Prayer as follows: "And we also *bless Thy Holy Name* for all Thy servants departed this life in Thy faith and fear:

beseeching Thee to give us grace so to follow their good examples, that we with them may be partakers of Thy heavenly kingdom." Thus the words "*bless Thy Holy Name for*" are craftily transformed into "*pray for*;" and this is the way which men calling themselves ministers of Christ think to advance the cause of religion in the community to which they profess to belong. Either this is done in ignorance or by design; if the former, it is pitiable; if the latter, it is disgraceful; and we do not wonder at such men being ashamed to give their names to such a glaring instance of clerical dishonesty, and are content to go on burrowing in the dark under the abused title of "Committee of Clergy."!!!

We leave our readers to judge how far the accusation of the teaching of the Homily concerning "Prayer for the Dead"⁸ being "loose and unscriptural" can be sustained, or whether those very epithets do not with far more propriety belong to the accuser and defamer of the Reformed Church of England, as a faithful witness in behalf of Primitive and Catholic truth in general, and on this subject in particular. That the Primitive Christians knew nothing of the modern doctrine of "prayer for the dead," as taught by the Church of Rome, and as copied from her by certain professed members of the Church of England, is evident from the following testimonies which we select from the mass of extracts all pointing the same way, and bearing witness to this one great Catholic verity, that there can be no alteration in the condition of the departed after death, but as the tree leans, so it falls, and as it falls, so it lies; so as man lives, he dies; and as death leaves him, so the resurrection will find him.

(1.) Justin Martyr, or the author of a work attributed to him, speaks on this wise relative to the uselessness of praying for the dead:—

"The story of Dives and Lazarus teaches us this doctrine, that after the departure of the soul from the body men cannot by any providence or care obtain any profit."⁹

⁸ Homily XIX., Part Third. *A Sermon concerning Prayer.*

⁹ Justin M., *Vel Auctor Quæst. et Respons. ad Orthodox.*, § 60.

(2.) Origen gives the reason why they commemorated the death of the faithful, but gives no intimation that the Primitive Christians ever prayed for the departed. He says:—

“We observe the memorials of the saints, and devoutly keep the remembrance of our parents or friends who die in the faith, rejoicing as well for their refreshing as requesting also for ourselves a godly consummation in the faith. *Thus, therefore, we celebrate the death*, not the day of the birth, because they which die shall live for ever.”¹

(3.) Cyprian expressly teaches:—

“When we are once departed from hence, *there is no further place for repentance*; no opportunity for making satisfaction will remain. Here life is either lost or obtained. Here we must provide for our eternal salvation by the worship of God, and the fruits of faith. Whilst we are in this world, no repentance is too late.”²

So much for the teaching of the Ante-Nicene Christians on the subject of “prayer for the dead;” and we have sufficient evidence that their successors in the faith of the Post-Nicene age was for centuries of a similar nature.

(4) Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis, bears testimony to the doctrine of the Churches of the *East* on this point as follows:—

“In the other world, after man’s death, *there is no help to be obtained*, neither by godliness, nor by repentance. . . . After death the King shuts the door, and admits none. After our departure, we may not correct what was formerly amiss in us.”³

(5.) And Hilary, Bishop of Poitiers, expresses the teaching of the Churches of the *West* in a similar way. He says:—

“As soon as this life is ended, there is no more deferring or delay. For the day of judgment is either an eternal payment of blessedness or of punishment; every one has his own law at the time of death; he is reserved for the day of judgment, either in Abraham’s bosom, or in a place of torment.”⁴

(6.) With this agreeth the positive assertion of Gregory Nazianzen:—

“There is not any cleansing after the night of this world.”⁵

¹ Origen, *Commen. in Job*, lib. iii.

² Cyprian, *Ad Demetr.*, § 25.

³ Epiphanius, *Contr. Cath. Hær.*, § 59.

⁴ Hilary, *in Psalm 2*.

⁵ Greg. Naz., *Orat. 32 in Pasch.*

(7.) And Augustin, in a multitude of passages which might be extracted from his writings, teaches the same doctrine :—

“After we have passed from this life there remains no compunction or satisfaction. . . . There is no middle place for any, so that he can be nowhere except with the devil, who is not with Christ. . . . Of a third place we are entirely ignorant, nor shall we find it in the Holy Scriptures.”⁶

(8.) As another witness for the Eastern Church we give that of Chrysostom, who speaks with the same precision as Augustine :—

“When we shall have departed this life there is no room for repentance ; nor will it be in our power to wash out any spots we have contracted, or to purge away any of the evils we have committed.”⁷

(9.) And for the Western Church of a later period we find Theodoret confirming the same doctrine by declaring that—

“After death the punishment of sin is without remedy.”

(10.) We close with the testimony of Gregory the Great, the last of the Popes before Rome fell from the faith, who distinctly teaches :—

“Infidels and wicked men departed out of this life are no more to be prayed for than the devil and his angels, who are appointed unto everlasting punishment.”⁸

As a contrast to such teaching on the part of one who professes to belong to the same Church as Gregory the Great, we may adduce the testimony of Cardinal Wiseman, as one speaking the mind of the modern Church of Rome on this subject, and which shows the gulf which exists between her teaching in the present day, and what it was in the days of Gregory the Great.

“The two doctrines, viz., *Purgatory* and *Prayer for the Dead*,” says Wiseman, “go so completely together, that if one is demonstrated the other necessarily follows ; the practice of praying for the dead is essentially based on a belief in purgatory.”⁹

⁶ Augustine, *Hom. 5 in 1 Tim.* iv. ; *De Peccat. Merit.*, lib. i. c. 28 ; *Hypog. Contr. Palag.*, v.

⁷ Chrysostom, *Hom. 2 in Lazar.*

⁸ Greg. Max., *Moral in Job*, lib. xxxiv. c. 16.

⁹ *Lectures*, by Cardinal Wiseman, vol. ii. p. 53.

And that belief in purgatory is one of the fundamental articles in the Roman Church we know from its modern creed, which reads :—

“I constantly hold that there is a *purgatory*, and that the souls therein detained are helped by the suffrages of the faithful.”¹

This was supported by the bold and utterly false statement of Cardinal Bellarmine, that “*all the ancients, both Greek and Latin, from the very time of the apostles, did teach that there was a purgatory.*”² The confidence with which this statement is made is a noteworthy instance of the temerity of ardent controversialists; but the quotations we have already given will show how contrary to fact this broad statement really is, as other Roman authorities, who have a greater regard for truth, have distinctly admitted. Thus Otho Frisingensis, a Roman bishop of the twelfth century, in his *Chronicon*, declares that—

“The doctrine of purgatory was *first* built upon the credit of those fabulous dialogues attributed to Gregory I., about the year 600.”

And Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, of the time of Henry VIII., affirmed that “the doctrine of purgatory was *for a long time unknown*; and even unto this day the Greeks do not believe it.” Alphonsus à Castro, in his work against heretics, says,—

“In the ancient writers there is *scarcely any mention* of purgatory, especially in the Greek writers, and therefore by the Grecians it is not believed unto this day.”

The Jews knew nothing of such a doctrine, as appears from Rabbi David Kimchi, who, in his Commentary on Isaiah lv. 6, says, “After death there is no conversion of the soul.”

Although it is sufficiently evident that the Primitive Chris-

¹ Creed of Pope Pius IV., authorized by a Bull, December 9th, 1564; passed in contempt of two General Councils, viz., that of Ephesus, A.D. 431, by a canonical decree, as well as that of Chalcedon, A.D. 451, in its definition of the faith, which prohibited under the severest penalties any attempt “to bring forward, or to write, or to compose, or to devise, or to teach any other creed besides that which was settled by the holy fathers assembled in the city of Nice with the Holy Ghost.”

² Bellarm., *De Purgat.*, lib. i. c. 1.

tians knew nothing whatever of the doctrine of PURGATORY, or the duty of praying for the dead in the vain hope of altering the condition of the departed, such as the modern Church of Rome teaches, and such as our Ritualistic clergy are advocating at the present time, there can be little doubt that Papal Rome has inherited this doctrine, like so many others which separate her by an impassable gulf from the Catholic Church of Christ, from her Pagan ancestry. No such doctrine as a Romish purgatory, nor the remotest grounds for it, is to be discovered in Scripture, as we have already seen. But in the Sixth Book of the *Æneid* we find the exact pattern of this anti-scriptural, irrational, but, to an unscrupulous priesthood, most lucrative imposture, so graphically described by Virgil:—

“The ghosts rejected are the unhappy crew
Deprived of sepulchres and funeral due:
A hundred years they wander on the shore;
At length, their *penance* done, are wafted o’er.”

The Church England very properly deals with this and other similar absurdities, by authoritatively declaring that—

“The Romish doctrine concerning *purgatory*, pardons, &c., is a fond thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God.” (Article XXII.)

CHAPTER XVI.

PICTURES AND IMAGES.

THAT the Church of Rome is much given to the use of *Pictures* and *Images*, which are as closely connected with each other as are the doctrines of *Purgatory* and *Prayer for the Dead*, discussed in the preceding chapter, is too notorious to be denied. And the meaning which she places upon the introduction of such antisciptural and uncatholic novelties amongst professing Christians, may be gathered from the following testimonies on the part of her attached members.

It is nearly five centuries ago that a Council held at one of our English universities, which has given its name to the Ritualistic practices of modern days, passed a decree on the subject, which runs as follows :—

“Henceforth let it be commonly taught and preached by all that *the cross* and *the image of the crucifix*, and the rest of *the images of the saints*, in memory and honour of them whom they represent, as also their places and relics, *ought to be worshipped with processions, bending of the knee, and bowings of the body.*”³

We shall presently see how closely the promoters of the “Oxford movement” have followed in the steps of their spiritual ancestors, in complete contradiction of the Primitive and Catholic Church. And much respecting the meaning which Romanists attach to the introduction of pictures and images representing the figures of Christ and dead saints, may be gathered from the following testimonies. Thomas Aquinas, a high authority in the Church of Rome, says :—

³ Constitutions of the Council at Oxford, A.D. 1408. *Gal. Lyndewode Province*, lib. v., *de Hæret.*

“The same reverence is to be given to the image of Christ, and to Christ Himself; and consequently, since Christ is adored with the adoration of LATRIA, or divine worship, His image is to be adored with the worship of LATRIA.”⁴

Naclantus, Bishop of Clugum, explains this subject more fully, when he says:—

“It must not only be confessed that the faithful in the Church do adore *before* the images, as some would perhaps cautiously speak, but also *adore the image itself*, without any scruple; moreover, they reverence it with the same worship wherewith they do to the thing that is represented thereby.”⁵

The above language of this Roman bishop sufficiently refutes thereby the arguments of those who contend, that nothing more is meant than rendering due homage to persons to whom such images represent. Were such a modification of “image worship” admissible, it would enable us to justify the heathen idolatry of all ages and all kinds. It was in this way, we may conclude, that the introduction of *pictures* and *images* amongst professing Christians by the Gnostic heretics originally occurred, as Epiphanius mentions that “they had images of gold and silver, which they said were *representations of Christ*, made under Pontius Pilate, when he was among men.”⁶ Carpocrates and his disciple are believed to have been the first who introduced the heresy at Rome in the days of Pope Anicetus, A.D. 153—163, as St. Augustine declares that, “having privately made images of Jesus, Paul, Homer, and Pythagoras, they worshipped them.”⁷ Five centuries later, we find a remarkable historical statement of the way in which our ancient British

⁴ Thom. Aqu. *Summ.*, pt. iii., *Quæst.* xxv. Art. 3. Cardinal Cajetan, in his comment on this teaching of Aquinas says:—“Representations of God and Christ, of saints and angels, are not only painted in order that they may be shown as the cherubims were of old in the Temple, *but that they may be adored*, as the frequent use of the Church doth testify.”

⁵ Jacob Naclantus, Bishop of Clugium, in *Epis. ad Rom.*, cap. i., fol. 42. Venet. Edit., 1559.

⁶ Epiphanius, *Panarion*, *Hæres.*, § xxvii.

⁷ Augustin., *de Hæres.*, cap. vii.

Church *rejected* the attempt of the monk Augustine⁸ and his co-emissaries from Rome, (of which fact all lovers of Primitive Christianity will justly be proud,) to introduce the worship of *pictures* and *images* into this country, as the MS. records that :—

“The Brytayns wold not after that nether eate nor drinke with them, nor yet salute them, *because they corrupted with superstitius ymages and ydolatrie*, the true religion of Christe.”⁹

Two centuries later we rejoice to find Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, aptly describing the vain and foolish respect which some ill-taught Christians of his day paid to *pictures* and *images* as “baby worship;” and such appears to have been the opinion of the Primitive and Catholic Church from the beginning.

It is an old saying that history repeats itself; and if we remember the way in which the monk Augustine, as the emissary of the Church of Rome, presented himself to the King of

⁸ The pride which the monk Augustine displayed in his first interview with the bishops of the British Church, as recorded by so favourable a witness as Bede, is enough to prove how far removed from Primitive Christianity were the doctrines and practices he came to set up, as the emissary of Rome, and the precursor of that long-continued Papal usurpation in this country, until the dawn of the glorious Reformation in the sixteenth century. (Bede's *Eccles. Hist.*, lib. ii. cap. 2.) It would have been a happy thing for England, if the ancient British Church could have remembered the sound advice given by Taliessyn, the chief of the three Christian bards of Wales, about a century before the arrival of the monk Augustine in England, as recorded in Archbishop Usher's *Religion of the Ancient Irish*, ch. x :—

Woe be to the priest, y— born,
That will not cleanly weed his corn,
And preach his charge among ;
Woe be to that shepherd, I say,
That will not watch his foes away,
As to his office doth belong :
Woe be to him that doth not keep
From *Romish wolves* his sheep,
With staff and weapon strong.

⁹ Ancient MS. belonging to the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.

Kent, with his banners and pictures, and images and crucifixes, and then pass through the vista of the dark ages, and the more enlightened post-Reformation times, down to the present day, we find the same thing repeated by the Ritualistic clergy of the present day, not only in contempt of the teaching of all Primitive Christianity on the subject, but in direct violation of the Act of Parliament passed in the reign of Edward VI. I will only mention two out of an innumerable number of similar practices, which are surreptitiously creeping in amongst us in the present day, and which are either winked at, or allowed, or passed over unreprieved by the chief pastors of the Church, who hold their high office on the tenure of being—

“Ready with all faithful diligence to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God’s Word—as well as to correct and punish such as be unquiet, disobedient, and criminous within the diocese.”¹

In January, 1872, a display of the nature alluded to above took place at St. Paul’s College, Stony Stratford, in the presence of the Bishop of Oxford, the bishop of the diocese. After a strong remonstrance on the part of the faithful against such heathenish follies, and the sanction which the bishop’s presence was naturally supposed to give, as well as a singularly weak defence on the part of the bishop himself, one of his presbyters—the Rev. F. Young, Vicar of Walton—with Christian courage, for which he is deserving of the highest praise, reprovved his diocesan in the following faithful way:—

“With the deepest possible respect for your lordship’s high and sacred office, I will yet venture boldly to remind you, that you have been elevated to and hold that office simply as an administrator of clearly-defined Church truth and Church law, and not as an independent ruler. This being so, we are aggrieved by the late Stony Stratford superstitions, and repeat our inquiry, ‘How, when *altar lights*, and *crosses* or *crucifixes*, and *figure-painted banners*, have all been protested against or declared illegal, either by the Articles or Homilies, or authoritative interpretations of law, your lordship could allow, sanction, and encourage them?’ The sound Churchmen of England, my lord, expect their bishops, not to ‘be thinking of or looking up at’ *idolatrous banners* ‘in time of divine service,’ but (in the language of the second Homily against Peril of Idolatry,) as is ‘*the duty of vigilant bishops*,

¹ Service for the Consecration of Bishops in the Book of Common Prayer.

*to be careful that no images be permitted in the Church, for that they be no occasion of scruple and offence to the people committed to their charge.' It is idle, when flagrant breaches of the law, which you are set to administer, are brought to your notice, and you are asked to repress them, to allege your own individual views of 'toleration,' as a bar to your doing so. As well might a civil magistrate, who also is but an administrator of existing law, refuse to sentence or reprimand a *proved law-breaker* on the ground of his private feelings about toleration."*

In August, 1873, a similar offence against the laws of God and the land took place at the opening of St. Chad's College, Denstone, under the guidance of the Rev. Dr. Lowe, the first provost, and with the apparent approval and sanction of the Bishop of Lichfield, who was present during the whole of the proceedings. It was not merely the pompous processions which accompanied the opening, with its forbidden "birettas," and figures on "banners," in honour of the deified dead, and which naturally remind us of the description given by Apuleius and other heathen authors of the Pagan processions held at Rome in ancient times, which were so justly censured by Tertullian,² who expressly mentions these processions as a proof of the blindness and corruption of the heathen; but it is the incipient *Mariolatry*, which is so fast creeping into the Church of England, as witnessed by the St. Chad procession, and which has naturally excited the alarm as well as the strongest condemnation of every one who has the slightest regard for Primitive and Catholic truth. Among the many banners, "richly embroidered in silk," the account given in the *Guardian* states that, "the most resplendent was the banner of St. Nicholas'

² Tertullian says:—"In the matter of idolatry, *it makes no difference with us under what name or title it is practised*. If it is lawful to offer homage to the dead, it will be just as lawful to offer it to their gods; you have *the same origin in both cases*; there is the same idolatry on their part, and on ours the same renunciation of all idolatry." (*De Spectaculis*, § 6.) And in his work *On Idolatry*, ch. vii., he speaks specially of the grief of the faithful at the admission into the Church, and even into the ministry itself, of "Idol-artificers;" proving thereby how rapidly some in the Primitive Church had declined from the Catholic faith by the beginning of the third century.

College, the front of which was divided into two panels. In one was the figure of the Virgin Mary, with the inscription, 'MATER DEI;' and in the other, the figure of a bishop, with the words, 'Nicolas, Episc.'" It is needless to remind any one, well read in the writings of the Primitive Christians, that there is not the slightest authority for ascribing this heretical and idolatrous term of MATER DEI to her, whom all nations agree to term "blessed;" but it may be well to consider how this term came to be introduced into the Roman Church, as so many unfaithful Anglicans are now so vigorously striving to introduce it into ours.

The first persons recorded as paying divine honours to the "blessed" Mary, were an heretical sect of Christians, called *Collyridians*, so named from the colluridees, or "cakes," which they offered annually to "St. Mary" in sacrifice upon her festival day, when they worshipped her as a deified being, or "demon," as predicted by the Apostle Paul. This superstition originally came from Scythia and Arabia. While heathen they had been accustomed to offer *cakes* in worship to "the Queen of Heaven," known to the Assyrians as *Astarte*, and to the Greeks and Romans as *Venus*. On their profession of Christianity, they thought a similar honour might be given to "the Mother of Jesus;" but their sin was promptly condemned by Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis, one of the most eminent fathers of that period, as if he had foreseen the idolatry which nominal Christians in after ages would pay to Mary. Hence he asks, with righteous indignation:—

"Where is this to be found in Scripture? Which of the prophets have permitted a *man*, much less a *woman*, to be worshipped? A choice vessel was Mary indeed, but *only a woman*. . . . The body of Mary was holy, but not God; not given to us for adoration, but one that did herself worship Him who was born of her in the flesh, and who came down from heaven out of the bosom of the Father."

Then, after censuring the Collyridians at considerable length for their incipient idolatry in calling upon the "blessed" Mary in prayer, Epiphanius sums up the whole subject in these words:—

*“Let Mary be in honour, but let the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit be worshipped. Let no one worship Mary.”*³

It is to this great father that we are indebted for the most decisive testimony against the sin of having pictures as aids to worship in churches; which, as the merest tyro in ecclesiastical lore knows, were not introduced until the latter end of the fourth century. It appears from an epistle which Epiphanius addressed to John, Bishop of Jerusalem, and which has been translated by Jerome, that on one occasion, when he was passing through a village in Palestine, called Anablatha, he says:—

“I found there a veil hanging before the doors of the church, wherein was painted the image of Christ or some saint, (for I did not well remember which it was:) but seeing, however, the *image* of a man hanging in the church *against the authority of Scripture*, I tore it in pieces, and advised the churchwardens to make a winding-sheet of it, and to bury some poor man with it.”

Although heated controversialists, like Cardinals Bellarmine and Baronius, storm against this passage as an interpretation of some modern Greek iconoclast, the more honest Papal advocate Petavius admits its genuineness, as the overwhelming weight of evidence against “images and pictures” in churches before the fourth century compelled him to do.

In the century following this condemnation of both Mariolatry and picture worship by the faithful Bishop of Salamis in the *East*, Leo, Bishop of Rome in the *West*, (A.D. 440—461,) issued his anathema against Nestorius in these words:—

“We anathematize Nestorius, who believed the blessed Virgin Mary to be the bringer forth (genetrixem) *not of God, but only of man.*”

Ephraim of Theopolis, translating these words of Pope Leo into Greek, uses the word *metecr* to express the Latin *genetrix*, and observes that “*Leo was the first person who called the Holy Theotocos*”⁴ ‘Mother of God,’ which *none of the Fathers had*

³ Epiphanius, *Adv. Hæres*, lib. iii. § 79.

⁴ The term *Theotocos* was originally used by the Greeks, not as a title of honour pertaining to Mary, but in order to assert the true Deity of Christ, and that fundamental doctrine expressed by Hooker that “undoubtedly even the nature of God in the only person of the Son is incarnate, and hath taken

done before him in these words." From which it appears that the Greeks first called the "blessed" Mary *Theotocos*; the Latins afterwards interpreted that phrase by the term *Genetrix Dei*; the Greeks rendered the expression by *Metecr Theou*, which being retranslated into Latin, became *Mater Dei*, "Mother of God," in the language of the Church of Rome and of all others who have followed her heresy ever since. To give "the mother of Jesus," as Scripture calls her, the title of "Mother of God," confounds the divine and human natures of Christ. The divine nature never was born, and therefore could never have had maternity; the human nature was born, and of this only was Mary the mother; as the words of the so-called "Athanasian Creed" express it—"God, of the substance of the Father, begotten *before* the worlds; and Man, of the substance of His mother, born *in* the world; . . . One altogether; not by confusion of substance, but by unity of person. For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and Man is one Christ." As the Papists and Romanizers do not assert that Mary was the mother of the divine nature in Christ, it is strangely inconsistent as well as heretical to call her "the Mother of God."

The depths of heresy to which the modern Church of Rome has now sunk in respect to Mariolatry, should be a warning to the Provost of St. Chad's College and all Ritualists in general of the sin of taking *the first step*, "the only one which counts," according to the well-known French proverb, by ascribing to the blessed Mary the forbidden title of "Mother of God." The following specimens of Roman Mariolatry taken from the authorized formularies of that Church, will enable us to fathom this depth at once:—

"O come let us sing unto our Lady, let us heartily rejoice in *Mary the Queen of our Salvation*. For the dead shall not praise the Lady, neither they that are in the pit; but they who *through thy grace shall attain*

to itself flesh." It is quite clear to all who adhere to the "Primitive and Catholic" faith that the Bishop of Rome in his antichristian anathemas against Nestorius was more "heretical" than the person whom he so proudly and unrighteously condemned.

everlasting salvation. According to thine ordinances the world continues, whose foundations thou, too, with God, *didst lay from the beginning.* Whosoever will be saved, *before all things it is necessary that he hold the right faith about Mary.*"⁵

"Hail, Mary, lady and mistress of the world, to whom *all power has been given in heaven and earth.* All the blessed spirits in heaven do bless and praise you infinitely, for that *you are the great mediatrix between God and man,* obtaining for sinners all they can ask or demand of the blessed Trinity."⁶

This will suffice to show the lengths which the Church of Rome has gone in the worship of a woman, who, though rightly called "blessed among women," was a poor sinner needing her "Saviour" as much as ourselves. And in order to show how prepared the party in our Reformed Church, who have begun already to concede to her the uncatholic title of "Mother of God," are to go similar lengths, in their imitating a Church to which they really, though not nominally, belong, as they proudly boast of being "one with her in faith, orders and sacraments," we quote the testimony of an eye-witness to what was exhibited last year in the church of Mr. Mackonochie of St. Alban's, London. The visitor, who appears to have seen in that church one of those great hideous idols which are so common in all Roman churches, intended to represent "Mary the Mother of Jesus," writes as follows:—

"On the occasion of the mission in February, 1874, we were told of an '*Image of Jealousy,*' set up in 'St. Alban's.' We went, and saw with our own eyes, *an idol, life-size, in front of the altar.* Such blasphemous proceedings ought to fire the indignation of the authorities to take such proceedings as would place the actors in such scenes either in Newgate or Bedlam."⁷

⁵ From the *Psalter of Bonaventura*, Cardinal Bishop of Albano, who died in 1474, and was canonized by the "Infallible" Pope Sextus V., who declared in the decree of canonization, "We have most attentively read the *divine writings of this saint.* Being confident that in this canonization *God will not permit us to err,* we decree that Bonaventura be numbered in the list of the other saints of God."

⁶ *The Devotion of the Sacred Heart of Mary*, pp. 206, 293. One of the most popular works used by English Romanists in the present day.

⁷ The Monthly Record of the Protestant Evangelical Mission, p. 115.

Seeing these things are done in the Church of England by men professing to be her ministers, we turn back the page of history to see what the Primitive Christians thought and taught respecting the lawfulness of having *pictures and images* in places set apart for Him who is a Spirit, and who requires His worshippers to worship Him in spirit and in truth. We shall confine our testimony to that of the fathers of the first three centuries, but we rejoice to know that many of the great writers of the fourth century, such as Ambrose and Augustine, have expressed themselves as strongly against *pictures and images*, as we have already seen that Epiphanius did.

(1.) Clement of Rome, or the author of the *Clementine Recognitions*, condemns the whole system thus:—

“*The serpent, the devil, by the mouth of certain men, speaks thus: ‘For the honour of the invisible God, we worship visible images,’ which is most false without doubt. For if you will truly honour the image of God, you ought by doing good to man, to honour the true image of God in him. . . . For what honour of God is this, to have images of wood and stone, or to honour any vain image of Him? Know therefore that this is the suggestion of the serpent Satan, who persuades you that you are godly when you honour senseless and dead images.*”⁸

(2.) Athenagoras meets the excuses of image worshippers which the heathen made in former days, and which “false brethren” equally make now, in the following way:—

“Images are but earth, wood and stone curiously figured. But this, I know, is granted by some persons who readily allow that they are in themselves but mere images, though they will have them to be representatives of the gods; and thence argue that all worship paid to them is really paid to the gods they represent, *and that there is no other way by which we can approach the Divine Nature.*”⁹

“The Image of Jealousy,” which was worshipped by apostate Jews under the title of “the Queen of Heaven,” (Jer. vii. 18; Ezek. viii. 3, 5,) has ensnared apostate Christians in a similar manner, as they equally worship “the Queen of Heaven,” only under another name, which must be equally “abominable” to the great Creator, who is so righteously jealous of allowing His glory, to be given to another, or His praise to graven images.” (Isa. xlii. 8.)

⁸ Clem. Rom., *Recognitions*, lib. v. cap. 23.

⁹ Athenagoras, *Plea for the Christians*, chap. 17, 18.

(3.) Tertullian very properly points out that the sin of *making* any figure or image to be set up as an object which may possibly be worshipped, is equally great as that of *worshipping* it. Hence he says:—

“When the devil introduced images into the world, and representations of men, that sinful trafficking in human weakness derived both its name and its profit from idols. Hence every act which produces an idol, in whatever manner, becomes the head of idolatry. Consequently, every picture or image must be called an idol; God prohibiting as much the making of an idol, as the worshipping of it. Wherefore, in order to remove the very foundation of idolatry, the divine law proclaims, *Ye shall not make an idol*; and forthwith adds, *Nor the likeness of any thing in heaven or earth, or that is in the water under the earth.*”¹

(4.) Origen shows distinctly how free the Christians of his day were from the sin and folly of worshipping pictures or images.

“We deem those the most ignorant, who are not ashamed to address lifeless things, to petition the weak for help, to ask life from the dead, to pray for help from the most needy. And though *some may argue that these images are not gods, but only the figures or representations of them*, such persons fancying that imitations of the Godhead can be made by the hands of some mean artizan, are not a whit less ignorant and slavish and uninstructed. *From this foolish stupidity the very lowest and least informed of us Christians are exempt.*”²

(5.) In the dialogue of Minutius Felix, the Christian addresses his heathen opponent on this subject as follows:—

“It is manifest that your gods were mere men, whom we know to have

¹ Tertullian, *De Idolatriâ*, §§ 3 and 4. Bingham observes that “though the case is clear that Christians for near four hundred years did not allow images in churches, Tertullian, indeed, once mentions the *picture* of a shepherd bringing home his lost sheep upon a communion cup in some of the Catholic churches. But as this is a singular instance only of a symbolical representation or emblem, so it is the only instance Petavius pretends to find in all the three first ages. . . . They of the Romish Church have *invented an apostolical council at Antioch*, wherein not only the use, but the *worship of images* is pretended to be authorized by the apostles. And the credit of this council is stiffly defended by Baronius and others. But Petavius and others give it up as a *mere forgery*.” (Bingham’s *Antiquities*, lib. viii. ch. 8.)

² Origen, *Centr. Celsum*, lib. vii. ch. 62—66.

been born and died. Yet who doubts but what the people adore and publicly worship their consecrated images? How do any of these gods exist? Why, first, he is cast into a mould, or hewn from a block, or carved with a tool. However, he is not yet a god. When, lo! he is hoisted up, and fairly set on his legs. Nevertheless not yet a god. At length he is ornamented, consecrated, adored! *Now then he is a god at last!*"³

(6.) Arnobius replies to the folly of those who pretend that though they have images, that they do not worship them, but only the beings whom the images represent; an excuse which is as common and useless with Christians now as it was when made by the heathen of old:—

"You heathen allege that you worship the gods through the medium of images. What then? Even if there were no images in existence, could the gods be ignorant that they were worshipped; could the gods fancy that you paid them no honours? You tell us that they receive your prayers and supplications through a sort of go-between; and before they know what worship is due to them, you make offerings to the images, and transmit as it were the remains of your devotion to the gods. Now what can be more injurious or insulting than *to have the knowledge of God, and yet to supplicate another thing? to expect assistance from Deity, and yet to offer prayers to a senseless image?*"⁴

(7.) Lactantius argues in the same way against the sin and folly of both making images as well as paying any respect to the work of men's hands:—

"What madness it is for men either to make images, which they may afterwards fear, or to fear images which they themselves have made. They say, 'We do not fear the images, but the Being after whose likeness they are made.' Why, then, do not you lift up your eyes to heaven? Why do you turn to figures, and pictures, and images, rather than look where you believe your God to be? . . . If a man should make an image of his absent friend, that he might comfort himself by looking at it during his absence, would he be deemed in his right mind if he should persist in looking at the image after his friend had returned? Nay, if he would rather regard the image than the friend? Certainly not. For the image of a man may appear necessary in contrast to the Divine Being, whose Spirit being everywhere diffused, can never be absent. *Therefore an image is always useless.*"⁵

³ Min. Felix, *Octavius*, cap. xxiii.

⁴ Arnobius, *Adv. Gentes*, lib. v. c. 9.

⁵ Lactantius, *The Divine Institutes*, lib. ii. § 2,

It is thus quite evident what the teaching of the Primitive Christians was respecting the sin and folly of those, who without a revelation from on high, were guilty of making representations of any sort or kind, either of the Divine Being, or of any of the deified dead. And what was bad enough with the heathen is far worse amongst professing Christians. The poor heathen were guilty through ignorance; those who with a revelation from God adopt similar practices, or in any way give their sanction to them, are far more criminal, and incur a much greater amount of responsibility, for which they will have to give an account at the day of judgment. And so careful were the Primitive Christians against the faintest approach to the heathen practice of having either *pictures* or *images* in their places of worship, that we find, in one of the councils held at the beginning of the fourth century, when Christendom and heathendom were beginning to amalgamate with one another, a decree to the following effect:—

“It is our pleasure that *pictures ought not to be in churches*, lest that which is worshipped or adored should be painted on the walls.”⁶

We have seen at the commencement of this chapter how the Church of England, at the beginning of the fifteenth century, when she was allied to the fallen and corrupted Church of Rome, decreed by the mouth of her unfaithful clergy in a Convocation at Oxford, that “*the cross, and the image of the crucifix, and the rest of the images of the saints, were to be worshipped with processions, bending of the knee, and bowings of the body;*” we rejoice to be enabled to point to the well-authenticated fact, that the Church of England, (then as now

⁶ Council of Eleberis, A.D. 305, *Canon* 36. Du Pin, an eminent Roman Catholic authority, in his *Eccles. Hist.*, cent. iv. vol. i. p. 243, observes that the decree of the Council Eliberis “*has exercised divines much;*” which is not to be wondered at, since it is quite impossible to reconcile it with the authorized practice of the Roman Church for so many ages; and which, alas! is now being imitated by many amongst ourselves who, although they are perpetually talking about “Primitive and Catholic” truths, make a point of always disregarding them, when they conflict with their own “private judgment” of what they deem lawful and right.

the fairest branch of the true Catholic Church on earth,) in the middle of the sixteenth century, cast away those spiritual enticements by which that awful Communion, described in the infallible Word as “MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH,”⁷ had for so many ages bewitched and enthralled the nations of Christendom; having passed by means of her laity, more faithful to the commandments of God and the doctrines of Christ than their predecessors among the clergy of the preceding century, the celebrated *Act of Parliament* in the 3rd and 4th of King Edward VI., in which it was enacted that certain books, which had been used in churches by Popish priests, should be utterly abolished and destroyed, lest they should lead Christians into the deadly sin of IDOLATRY in the future as they had done in the *past*. These books are entitled:—

“Antiphoners, Missalles, Grailes, *Processionals*, Manuels, Legends, Pies, Portuasses, Primers in Latin and English, Couchers Journals, Ordinals, or other books or writings whatsoever, heretofore used for the service of the Church, other than such as shall be set forth by the King’s Majesty, shall be utterly abolished, extinguished, and forbidden for ever to be used or kept in this realm, or elsewhere within the King’s dominions.”

Having thus very righteously abolished all further use of the service books of the Church of England previous to the Reformation, which sanctioned the worship of images, and a multitude of other antichristian and superstitious observances, the second clause of the Act proceeds to deal with the vain and useless pictures and images themselves, which had heretofore been set up in churches for the people to worship:—

“And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that if any person or persons, of what degree, estate, or condition whatsoever he, she, or they be, bodies politic or corporate, that now have, or hereafter shall have in his, her, or their custody any of the books or writings of the sorts aforesaid, or any images of stone, timber, alabaster, or earth, graven, carved, or painted, which heretofore have been taken out of any church or chappel, or yet stand in any church or chappel, and do not before the last day of June next ensuing deface and destroy, or cause to be defaced and destroyed, the said

images every one of them, or cause to be delivered all and every the same books, &c. &c., to the archbishop, bishop, chancellor or commissary of the same diocese, by whom the books are to be immediately burnt or destroyed, . . . they shall pay for the first offence a fine of 10*l.*; for the second offence a fine of 80*s.* (equal to about £50 of present money;) and for the third offence be imprisoned during the king's pleasure."⁸

Such was the wise provision which the faithful laity of the Reformed Church of England made against any return to that abominable system of IDOLATRY which existed in our Church during the dark ages, by the setting up of *pictures* and *images* as objects of worship, which is so pleasing to the natural heart of man, but so offensive in the eyes of God.

⁸ Although the recently pronounced judgment in the *Exeter Reredos Case*, delivered 25th February, 1875, will be read with regret by those who remember how gradual was the introduction of images and pictures into churches before the Reformation; and how, subsequently, they were turned to a "superstitious use," and were made objects of idolatry; this judgment, when confirmed by the Supreme Ordinary of the Church, will be received by every Evangelical throughout the kingdom with that respect which is due on Scripture grounds to the rulers in Church and State, and in a very different manner from the way in which the Ritualists have been in the habit of treating judgments proceeding from the same source in direct opposition to the Apostolic injunction, "Obey them that have the rule over you." We may, however, indulge the hope that time may prove their lordships of the Judicial Committee were right in expressing their confidence that "no superstitious reverence is likely to be paid to any figures forming part of the reredos."

CHAPTER XVII.

THE REFORMED CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

FROM the evidence adduced in the foregoing pages it is certain that the Primitive Christians knew nothing of any material "altar" in their acts of worship; that the only one which they recognised was that of *Christ Himself*, who was to them both "altar," and also the "sacrifice" on the altar; and that for any Christian to apply such a term to the table whereon the Lord's Supper is administered, betrays both a lamentable ignorance of Primitive and Catholic truth, as well as an inclination to return to the bondage of the Church of Rome from which our fathers were mercifully delivered by the Reformation of the sixteenth century; for the word itself ("altar") symbolises a dead Christ in place of a living Saviour. Nor did they know anything of what in modern days is called "the Eucharistic Sacrifice;" the only sacrifice they preached, after the example of the apostle, was that "reasonable, holy and lively sacrifice of themselves, their souls and bodies," to the service of God, which the Church of England calls upon her members to make, when partaking of the Lord's Supper. Nor did they acknowledge any such doctrine as that of what is now called "the Real Objective Presence"—a term invented in the nineteenth century⁹—the only aim of the Primitive Christians being to *realize* as much as possible their Saviour's presence at all times and in all places, especially when, in accordance with His own gracious promise,

⁹ The term "Real Presence," without the adjunct "Objective," may be lawfully used in a spiritual sense, as Archbishop Sharp justly observes:—"When our Church speaks of *the Real Presence* in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, she means that the Holy Spirit of Christ is present in that ordinance to apply to every faithful communicant all the benefit of Christ's sacrifice."

“two or three were gathered together in His name,” and they felt He was “in the midst” of them. The theory of terming a piece of consecrated bread “God,” whom we are bound to adore, appears to have been derived from the most ignorant Pagans, whom the heathen philosopher Cicero, and the Christian philosopher Clement of Alexandria, have alike condemned with equal severity for thinking it possible that man should be so senseless as to attempt *to make his Maker, and then to eat his God!*

With regard to the claim in the present day of ministers of the Church of England to introduce “vestments,” “lights,” save when required for giving light, and “incense,” as necessary adjuncts for the administration of the Lord’s Supper, we have had ample evidence that such things were regarded by the Primitive Christians as distinctly heathenish and anti-christian—that coloured vestments were suitable only for the “priests of Bacchus;” and that the attempt to introduce artificial light in place of the light which God had provided for our daily use was pronounced by an eminent divine of the fourth century as the act of foolish madmen.

So, likewise, for any Christian minister to assume what is now called “the eastward position,” and to turn his back upon the people at the administration of the Lord’s Supper, was never once heard of amongst Primitive Christians. Had any minister, in that bright period of the early Church, adopted such a custom, he would have been regarded by the faithful as turning away from that favoured place where the Saviour declared He would be, or in other words, as turning his back upon Christ Himself.

“Auricular confession” was, to use the language of the late Bishop Blomfield, “a practice utterly unknown to the Primitive Church, one of the most fearful abuses of that of Rome, and the source of unspeakable abominations.”

“Priestly absolution,” in the sense now taught in the Church of Rome, and closely copied by the Romanizing party in the Church of England, was never heard of until the twelfth century of the Christian era. The custom of “praying for the

dead," with its necessary concomitant the doctrine of "purgatory," was a mere imitation of Paganism, as is clearly shown by the description given of it by the heathen poet Virgil. "Pictures and images," when first attempted to be introduced into churches as useful adjuncts to worship, were sternly forbidden by the authority of the Christian pastors, who had the wisdom to foresee the great encouragement they would give to idolatry, which the overwhelming evidence of the last few centuries has only proved too true in the case of the fallen and apostate Church of Rome.¹

An anecdote related of Dr. Cumming will expose the folly of the doctrine of purgatory as taught by the Church of Rome. A Roman Catholic lady once heard him preach on the text, "Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord—that they may rest from their labours; and their works do follow them." These words kindled in her heart convictions which she could not allay. She was once supposed to be dying. "I was given over," she said, "and a priest was sent for to administer extreme unction. He did so; I had full possession of my senses, and asked him, 'Now, tell me, my father, am I safe?' And he answered, 'I can pledge my own salvation that you will be ultimately safe.' 'Ultimately; what does it mean.' 'My child, you must pass through *purgatory*.' I said, 'I have had extreme unction administered, what is the nature of that purgatory through which I have to pass?' 'My child, purgatory

¹ As I have had occasion to call attention (p. 5) to that distinguished Romanist Count Montalembert, as condemning the Church of England for claiming the title of "Catholic," I am glad to have found authority for believing that towards the close of his life his eyes were being gradually opened to the enormities of the Church of Rome, both in doctrine and practice, as the following words, addressed by him to Mr. Lisle Phillips, appear to show:—"As a Roman Catholic, I wish that what I believe to be truth should triumph; but when I consider the moral bearings of the question—the high tone of moral integrity that is *preserved by the Church of England* and the English people, I must confess I fear that *the consequences of union with us as we are, would be to draw you down to our level instead of raising us up to yours.*"

is a place where you must endure the torments of the damned, but of shorter duration.' ” Such is the comfort which the Church of Rome holds out to the dying members of her communion. Providentially, in this instance, the above-mentioned text led her to see the falsity of the doctrine of purgatory, and eventually to abandon Popery for saving faith in the work of Christ.

But as well as rejecting all these superstitious accretions to the public worship of God in the service of the sanctuary, which so many of the clergy are now craving after, and seeking by every subtle art and device to restore, notwithstanding that they have all been pronounced “illegal and unauthorized” by that supreme authority in our Church, which every clergyman is most solemnly pledged to obey—the religion of the Primitive Christians was essentially of a spiritual nature, in accordance with that fundamental axiom of Protestantism in its true and legitimate sense that “God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth”—as a contrast to certain persons of all ages and all ranks, of whom it may be said, in the language of Scripture, that though “they have a zeal of God, it is not according to knowledge;” though they have “a form of godliness,” they virtually “deny the power thereof;” for they appear to be “bewitched,” like the Galatians of apostolic days, with the idea of thinking to obtain justification by works in place of that fundamental truth of the Catholic Church, viz., justification “only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by faith, and not for our own works or deservings,” (Article XI.,) and to be satisfied with a system which consisted, previous to the promulgation of the Gospel, “only in meats and drinks, and divers washings and carnal ordinances, imposed until the time of reformation.” (Heb. ix. 10.) Above all things, the Primitive Christians made it the one great object of life, like the devoted Paul, in their faith and practice to “know nothing but Jesus Christ and Him crucified,” upon the principle so well expressed in the *Preface* to our Book of Common Prayer, that “*Christ’s Gospel is not a ceremonial law, (as much of Moses’ law was,) but it is a*

religion to serve God, not in bondage of the figure or shadow, *but in the freedom of the spirit.*"

Such was the teaching of the Primitive Christians during the best and purest days of the history of the Church, and it was the chief aim of the Reformers of the sixteenth century, as it has been of all other Protestant Churches founded since that great era, which adhere to the one ancient mark of the Catholic faith, viz., belief in the blessed Trinity—to return to such primitive doctrines and practices from which the Church of Rome has so widely departed—1st, at the beginning of the seventh century, when she attempted to "lord it over God's heritage" by assuming the title of "Universal Bishop," which Pope Gregory I.² had distinctly proclaimed to be *a mark of Antichrist*; and, 2nd, towards the close of the nineteenth century, when the Vatican Council in 1870 decreed the personal infallibility of the Pope, which would alone be sufficient in the estimation of every true Catholic to convict him of fulfilling all

² In consequence of John, Bishop of Constantinople, having assumed the unlawful title of "Universal Bishop," Gregory I., then Bishop of Rome, wrote as follows:—"I confidently say, that whosoever calls himself UNIVERSAL BISHOP, or desires to be so called, in his pride, is *the forerunner of Antichrist*, because in his pride he prefers himself to the rest. And he is conducted to error with a similar pride; for as that *wicked one* wishes to appear a god above all men, so, whosoever he is, who alone desires to be called a bishop, extols himself above all other bishops." (*Gregory to Mauricius Augustus, Register of Letters, Book 7, Indiction 15, Epist. 33.* Benedict. Edit., Paris, 1705.) Cardinal Bellarmine, in his *Treatise on the Roman Pontiffs*, explains the titles, with many others, belonging to every Pope as follows:—"Pope, father of fathers, high priest, vicar of Christ, head of the Church, foundation of the building of the Church, the bridegroom of the Church, *the universal bishop*," &c. (Book 2, ch. 31, Ingolstadt Edit., 1590.) Thus, as Pope Boniface III., about the year 610, assumed, with the consent of that wicked murderer and usurper, the Emperor Phocas, the forbidden title of "Universal Bishop," which his successors have retained down to the present day, it is manifest, according to the teaching of an "infallible" Pope, that the title of "Antichrist" belongs to them, as the Church of England in her *Homilies* most truly affirms; inasmuch as every Pope "appears as a god," sitting (*i.e.*, claiming rule) in the Church of God, "showing himself that he is a god."

the characteristic signs of the predicted "man of sin," as the Church of England declared three centuries ago:—

"Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is a God . . . whom the Lord shall consume with the Spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming." (2 Thess. ii. 4, 8.)

Now what has been the respective teaching of the two great parties which divide our Reformed Church at this present time into distinct, and, alas! that we should be compelled to add, hostile camps with reference to the doctrines and practices which have been considered at length in this work? We confidently ask every candid enquirer which system—the Evangelical or the Ritualistic—approaches nearest the teaching and customs of the Primitive Christians in their religious services?

Before entering upon this topic, we have some satisfaction in calling attention to the kind way in which two of the most eminent of the Ritualistic party have spoken of the Evangelical system and Evangelical men; and then we shall endeavour to show the reason why, in faithfulness to our common Master, we are unable, to use a well-known phrase, to return the compliment. Dr. Pusey, in his *Eirenicon*, thus expresses himself on the subject:—

"Ever since I knew them I have loved those who are called 'Evangelicals.' I loved them because they loved our Lord. I loved them for their zeal for souls. I often thought them *narrow*; yet I was often drawn to individuals among them more than to others who held truths in common with myself, which the Evangelicals did not hold, at least explicitly. I believed them to be 'of the truth.' I have ever believed, and believe that their faith was and is, on some points of doctrine, much truer than their words. . . . I never met with any who held the *Lutheran doctrine of justification*, that 'justifying faith is that whereby a person believes himself to be justified.' To others, who were not Calvinists, I believe all which you believe; *we only part, where you deny.*"³

Whether Dr. Pusey's view of the Lutheran doctrine of Justification be a correct one I do not know, but if it be no truer than

³ *Eirenicon*, pp. 4, 5.

his representation of the specialities of those whom he “loves for their zeal for souls,” I do not think it will be deemed a fair one by those who have experienced the blessedness and comfort of Evangelical truth implanted in their hearts by the Holy Ghost, or, to use Scriptural language, what the Apostle calls “the truth as it is in Jesus.” Dr. Pusey pronounces the Evangelicals to be “narrow,” and very truly observes, “*we only part, where you deny.*” But Dr. Pusey appears to be totally unconscious that what he terms “narrowness” in the Evangelicals, is simply their endeavour to preach faithfully the Gospel of Christ, who has declared in most solemn words of unmistakable plainness that “strait is the gate, and *narrow is the way*, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it.” (Matt. vii. 14.) Respecting what Dr. Pusey says about our “parting only when denying” the peculiarities of Ritualism, it is on this point that Evangelical men must ever be as firm as a rock, in obedience to the command of the inspired Apostle, that “if we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed.” (Gal. i. 8.) For we are constrained sorrowfully to declare our firm belief that Ritualism, such as it is presented to us in the well-known “Mackonochie” and “Purchas” cases, the logical and legitimate outcome of the Ritualistic creed, is that “other gospel” so solemnly denounced in the Word of God.

The difference between the “Evangelicals” and the “Ritualists” is that for which the martyrs of the Reformation joyfully went to the stake, and which their true successors of the Evangelical school would, by God’s grace and God’s help, as cheerfully give their lives in order to secure what they know and feel to be emphatically “the truth” as revealed in God’s word, as taught by Christians of the primitive age, as held by genuine Catholics of all ages, and notably by our martyred Reformers of the sixteenth century, and which may be summed up in one sentence, as expressed by the celebrated Bishop Hall more than two centuries ago, “NO PEACE WITH ROME.” Dr. Pusey, on the other hand, has marred his otherwise great career by unceasingly endeavouring by every means in his power to

prove to the world at large the necessity not only of making "peace with Rome" upon almost any terms which she may condescend to demand, by the application of that refined art of casuistry, which Mr. Maskell has so justly and vigorously exposed, and by which Dr. Pusey attempts to convince the world that there is really no reason why the Churches of England and Rome should not be again united, (see p. 69;) for according to the specific declaration of one of the organs of his party, "in faith, in orders, and in sacraments we are really one;" or, as another expresses it, "we are one with Roman Catholics in faith, and *have a common foe to fight*"—that *common foe* being the Evangelicals of the Church of England, and our Protestant brethren of other Reformed Churches throughout the world.

In another way Canon Liddon, while expressing still more pointedly his appreciation of the truths which the "Evangelicals" cling to, and contend for, as dearer than life, nevertheless considers the "sacramental," or sacerdotal, or Ritualistic way, as it may be variously termed, better still. Hence in the spring of 1872 we find Canon Liddon, at the laying of the first stone of a new church at St. Mary's, Soho, in London, speaking as follows on the subject now under consideration:—

"The services of this chapel represent the fruit of one of the greatest movements—probably I should only do it justice if I said *the greatest movement*—which has been brought about by God the Holy Spirit in the Church of England during the present century. I refer to what is called *the Oxford movement*. It was *not the first quickening of life* in the Church of England. . . The first movement of God's Holy Spirit amongst us was *the Evangelical*, which reanimated the sense of our Lord's living presence, of His glorious Godhead, of the priceless value of His atoning work, and the sanctifying power of the Holy Ghost, of the feebleness and sinfulness of poor human nature, unless it is washed in the blood of Jesus Christ, and sanctified by the grace of the Holy Spirit. So far as it went in a positive direction, *the Evangelical movement was the work of God the Holy Ghost, but it did not cover the whole area of God's revealed truth*. It did not point out with sufficient clearness that God had come among us by His Son and His Holy Spirit, not merely to redeem and sanctify mankind, but in order to found a spiritual kingdom. It omitted to point the *real meaning of value of the Sacraments as channels of that new life* which Christ our Lord has given us in the kingdom of the new covenant. This more complete statement of the truth was reserved for what is known as *the Oxford movement*."

Probably this statement on the part of Canon Liddon well expresses from a *moderate*, as distinct from an *ultra*-Ritualistic point of view, the real and vital difference which exists between the teaching of the two chief parties in the Church of England at this present time. Though all must admit that Canon Liddon's description of "*the Evangelical movement*," the early leaders of which may be named as Venn, Cecil, and Simeon, is no more than justice done to those eminent and pious ministers of the Church of England; on the other hand, no unprejudiced person, capable of distinguishing between truth and error, can for a moment admit that "*the Oxford movement*," headed by such men as Drs. Pusey, Newman and Manning, was "the better way," that it taught what Canon Liddon terms "the deeper truths," or that the sacerdotal and sacramental system of which he is so able an exponent, is superior to, or indeed to be compared for a moment to, the Evangelical movement of which he has spoken in so honourable a way. Every one who spiritually comprehends the essence of that movement, viz., that the work of the Holy Ghost, in thought, word and deed, must be recognised as the sole agent throughout, is compelled to avow that a movement such as the Oxford one, of which Canon Liddon speaks in such glowing terms, is of a *directly opposite tendency*.

Nothing has proved this more clearly than the Liddon-Capel controversy, which filled so many columns of the *Times* in the early part of the year 1875. It must have been a painful reflection for the Ritualistic party to see what a poor defence their advocate made in his replies to his Papal adversary; though it must be confessed that M. Capel's conduct was frank and straightforward throughout to a degree which his opponents must naturally envy and might profitably copy. When Canon Liddon talked about his having only a "limited relation" to a certain Ritualistic work, of which he admits having "revised" some of the proof-sheets before publication, and defrayed part of the expenses, he exposed himself to a crushing rejoinder on the part of his opponent. He may be compared to a man who has found the gunpowder and laid the train, but who

seeks to obtain credit for having abstained from pulling the trigger. M. Capel's assertion that "the Ritualistic clergy are *unintentionally*, but none the less assuredly, disseminating our doctrines," which he has proved by an amount of evidence that is simply overwhelming, needs correction in just one syllable. When we find the Ritualistic organs loudly contending that their object is to "unprotestantise" the Church of England, that they are "one in faith, in orders, and in sacraments with the Church of Rome," and pleading for eventual corporate union "with the see of Peter," surely M. Capel would have been more correct if he had written "*intentionally*," in place of the unmeaning negative. This opinion is confirmed by what he adds in his last letter: "While this discussion has been going on, I have made it a point to ask many of the converts from Ritualism whether they are conscious of any difference between their present and their former faith in this doctrine (of Transubstantiation). The invariable answer has been, 'Not the least, I only perceive more clearly what is meant.' *I need not say more.*" To which we may add our cordial *Amen*.

It is impossible to suppose, from the promise which our blessed Lord made to His disciples the night before He was crucified, that he would send the Holy Ghost "to guide" His people "into all truth" and to "abide" with them for ever, that the Spirit of the living God can teach *in such distinctly opposite directions* as the Evangelical and sacramental systems necessarily involve. We believe the one is faithful to the teaching of our Reformers, and consequently in accordance with that of the Primitive Church; the other expounds "another gospel, which is not another," and which, if carried out to its legitimate ends, must necessarily lead the honest upholder of the system into communion with the Church of Rome.

This will be seen, not merely in the fact that of the three prominent leaders of the Oxford movement, whose names have been just mentioned,—two have honestly apostatized, while the third has made himself conspicuous by teaching, as Dr. Newman had before attempted to do in *Tract* No. XC., that "our Articles and the Council of Trent could be so explained as to be reconcilable

one with the other,"⁴ and, therefore, ought in all honesty to have sought refuge in the Church of Rome long ago,—but also in another fact, that the whole tendency of the Oxford movement is a crafty attempt to set aside the distinctive principles of the Reformation, and to bring us again into subjection to Rome. It is as notorious as the noonday sun, not merely that the principles of the Oxford movement half-a-century ago, as expressed in *Froude's Remains*, "of hating the Reformation and the Reformers more and more," and that "the Reformation was a limb badly set, which must be broken again in order to be righted," are similar to those expressed by the Ritualistic organs at the present time, viz.:—that "the English Church is really one with the Church of Rome in faith, orders, and sacraments," and that the differences between the two "are infinitesimal,—the priesthood the same, the liturgy virtually the same, and the doctrine the same,"—but that these principles are also *in direct antagonism to the Reformation of the sixteenth century*, as carried out after the death of Edward VI., and the martyrdom of our bishops, clergy, and people, during the reign of "bloody" Queen Mary.

The *Injunctions* published at the commencement of Queen Elizabeth's reign required, amongst other things, "*altars to be taken down*," "*all pictures and paintings in glass windows within churches to be destroyed*," as well as "*all other monuments of idolatry*." Has not the practical result of the Oxford movement been, amongst many others of a similar tendency, *to restore every one of these things*? It is a well-known historical fact, that when Queen Elizabeth, who was personally disposed to ceremonies, or what is now termed by the Ritualists as "symbolical worship," manifested some intention to allow the use of images, crosses, and crucifixes in churches, Archbishop Parker with others presented an address to the Queen, declaring they could not assent to this, as it tended to "error,

⁴ *English Church Union Circular*, July, 1866, p. 197. For Archbishop Whateley's and Bishop Phillpott's opinion of this mode of preaching the Gospel, or, as Canon Liddon calls it, "the deeper truths" of the Oxford movement, see p. 91.

superstition, and idolatry, and finally to the ruin of souls." They protested also against the restoration of *altars*, saying:—

"Whereas your Majesty's principal purpose is utterly to abolish *all the errors and abuses used about the Lord's Supper, especially to root out the Popish mass* and superstitious opinions concerning the same, *the altar is a means to work the contrary.*"

Their protest was successful; and hence, we see that in the Book of Common Prayer no such word as "altar" is to be found; but the words, "holy table," "the Lord's board," have ever since been employed to denote the place suitable to the believer for receiving the Lord's Supper. We have already seen how the word "altar" has been recently revived and introduced into the nomenclature of the Ritualistic party, and indeed it may be regarded as one of the Shibboleths of their religious system; but it is directly contrary to the terms employed by the Primitive Christians as well as by the Reformers of the sixteenth century. Even as late as the fourth century, when the post-Nicene Church was rapidly gliding into the predicted apostasy, we find so eminent a bishop as Chrysostom, when describing the "various sacrifices" of Christians, which, he says, "do not fall in with the law, but are suited to *Evangelical* grace," adds:—

"And dost thou desire to be taught these sacrifices which the Church has, that without blood, without smoke, *without altar*, and other things, the Gospel gift returns to God, and that sacrifice is pure and undefiled."⁵

Nothing perhaps more aptly describes the vast gulf which separates the Evangelical and Ritualistic systems, in the distinction between the *spiritual* grace of the former and the *sacramental* grace of the latter, than this brief passage of the

⁵ Chrysostom, *Homil. in Psal.* 96. It may be noted that the term "Evangelical grace," of the Latin version, reads in the Greek, "Angelic," but the meaning is evidently the same. Just as Cyril of Alexandria uses the term, which we have selected as our motto, "Evangelical preaching is grace by faith, justification in Christ, and sanctification through the Holy Ghost." *Comm. in Esaiam*, lib. iii. Or, as his namesake, Cyril of Jerusalem, says in a passage, which I have been unable to verify, but which doubtless represents the true sentiments of that great divine when he says very beautifully, "The coming of the Spirit is gentle; most light is His burden; beams of light and knowledge gleam forth before His coming."

“golden-mouth” Patriarch of Constantinople, which those who make such pretensions to follow “Primitive and Catholic truth” in the sacramental and sacerdotal sense, would do well to take heed.

It may, therefore, be right to consider in as brief a compass as possible, some of the vital and widening differences between the two chief parties now existing in our Reformed Church. The public avowals of the sacerdotal party, whether Tractarian or Ritualistic, have been frankly declared from the commencement of the Oxford movement nearly half-a-century ago, and consistently continued down to the present day. The object of this movement has been expressed over and over again in these terms, and practically carried out with the following results:—

“To hate the Reformers and the Reformation more and more—to unprotestantise the Church of England as far as we can—to hate Protestantism with an undying hatred—to affirm the entire unity in faith, orders, and sacraments, between the Churches of England and Rome—to show how a clergyman may hold all Roman doctrine while retaining his position in the English Church—to show how easily the law may be evaded—to revile the bishops, and all opponents in general, and the Evangelicals in particular—to treat the judgments of the Sovereign, the Supreme Ordinary, with supreme contempt—and eventually to plead for corporate union with the Church of Rome.”

The learned Dr. Littledale, one of the most cherished leaders of the Ritualistic school, has thought it compatible with Christian charity to declare, not in the heat of debate, but as his calm and deliberate opinion, which opinion he has for several years most consistently defended, that though “the Jacobins, Robespierre, Danton, and Marat, sinned deeply in cruelty, impiety, and licentiousness, they were left far behind in all these particulars by Crammer, Ridley, and Latimer, the leaders of the English Reformation.”⁶ In a similar strain the *Church Times* of March 14th, 1868, speaks of the “English Reformation as an unmitigated disaster. It was simply a hypocritical pretence to veil an insurrection of lust and avarice against religion. The

⁶ *Innovations*, pp. 15, 31. I deem it only justice to Dr. Littledale to state, that I have found him to be in private a man of a very different spirit from what his publicly recorded sentiments would naturally seem to imply. I cannot attempt to explain this mystery; I merely record the fact.

Reformation of religion was taken in hand by a conspiracy of adulterers, murderers, and thieves."

Perhaps nothing more strikingly displays the vast and fathomless gulf between the Evangelicals and Ritualists than the opinions entertained by them respectively of the Reformers of the sixteenth century. The former regard them as "martyrs of Jesus," put to a cruel death by that terrible power described in Holy Writ as "drunken with the blood of the saints." The latter pronounce them to be "unredeemed villains," who far exceeded in cruelty and wickedness those who are universally considered to be the greatest monsters which the world has ever known.

It is difficult to explain how a professed Christian minister could arrive at such a conclusion respecting men, who, however erroneous their theological views as Romanists and Romanizers must naturally deem them, nevertheless gave their lives, which they might have saved at the expense of their conscience, for the religion which they believed to be true. We can only account for this surprising phenomenon upon the principle of priestcraft, which may be said in some degree to belong to all men in general, but which has inoculated our Ritualistic brethren in particular to an extraordinary degree. It is possible, I am inclined to think, that this love of sacerdotalism may be the key to explain the innumerable differences which separate by an impassable gulf the two chief parties in our Reformed Church at the present day. For if it has been the unceasing object of the Ritualists for the last half-century to minimise the differences between England and Rome, in order to show the possibility of remaining a clergyman of our Church while accepting and believing all the dogmas of the Papacy; the Evangelicals, on the other hand, as loyal members of the Protestant Church, accept the teaching of the Second Book of Homilies, which our Articles declare "doth contain a good and wholesome doctrine," in their plain and literal meaning, and consequently regard "the Bishop of Rome as Antichrist, and the successor of the scribes and Pharisees, rather than Christ's vicar or St. Peter's successor." (*Hom. X. pt. iii.*)

These differences are further seen in the opposite opinions entertained by the two parties on the subject of "GRACE." The Evangelical regards it *spiritually*, the Ritualist *sacramentally*; the one preaches, like the Apostle of old, "*the gospel of the grace of God*," which is "Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumblingblock, and unto the Greeks foolishness, but unto them which are called, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God;" the other sets forth "another gospel," and thereby, as St. Paul teaches, "perverts the gospel of Christ." Nowhere are such differences more apparent to those who look deeper than the mere outside of the cup and the platter, over which the storm is at present raging, than the treatment by the two parties of that great fundamental truth of the Catholic faith the doctrine of the TRINITY IN UNITY. The Ritualist confines himself to the exoteric view of the doctrine, while the Evangelical penetrates deeper into its spiritual significance and makes much of the esoteric teaching to be found therein. In place of confining himself to viewing God the Father as the Almighty Creator of man and things, the Evangelical loves to dwell with St. Paul upon His character as the great Elector of those who have known "the truth as it is in Jesus," and who therefore delight to be enabled to say:—

"Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ: according as He hath chosen us in Him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before Him in love: having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to Himself, according to the good pleasure of His will."⁷

So with regard to the Second Person of the Trinity, the Evangelical, in place of confining his teaching to the doctrine of Redemption, precious and important as that great truth ever must be in the economy of grace, dives deeper into the subject, and loves to dwell upon that part of our Saviour's character revealed both in the Old and New Testament as the "Lord our Righteousness." It is this blessed doctrine of Christ's righteous-

⁷ Eph. i. 3—5,

ness “imputed,” as St. Paul teaches,⁸ “unto all them that believe,” which made holy Bishop Beveridge exclaim, as he writes in his *Private Thoughts* :—

“I know not how it is with others, but for my own part, I do not remember, neither do I believe, that I ever prayed in all my lifetime with that reverence, or heard with that attention, or received the sacrament with that faith, or did any other work whatsoever, with that pure heart and single eye, as I ought to have done. Insomuch that I look upon all my righteousness as filthy rags; and it is in the robes only of the righteousness of the Son of God that I dare appear before the Majesty of Heaven.”

So likewise respecting the esoteric doctrine concerning God the Holy Spirit. It is not merely as the perpetual guide of the Church according to the Saviour’s promise that the Evangelical is content to dwell upon that portion of the Spirit’s work, but rather upon the Spirit’s aid to obtain that personal meetness for “the inheritance of the saints in light,” which the believer knows to be necessary for the enjoyment of heaven. Hence he loves to say, with that great master in Israel of ancient times, St. Augustine :—

“Proceed, O my soul, in those most pleasing contemplations, and think of those retired pleasures, which thy Lord entertains thee with in secret, and private conversation with Him. What delicious food He hath provided for the satisfying of thy spiritual hunger. What inestimable treasures of mercy He hath given thee richly to enjoy. What secret longings He inspires thee with, and how plentifully thou hast been made to drink of the ravishing cup of His love.”

In the same strain another great saint of modern times, Archbishop Leighton, teaches :—

“Spiritual things being once discerned by a spiritual light, the whole soul is carried after them, and the ways of holiness are never truly sweet till they be thoroughly embraced, with a full renunciation of all that is contrary to them. This were to walk with God indeed; to go all the day long as in our Father’s hand; whereas, without this, our praying morning and evening looks but as a formal visit; not delighting in that constant converse which is yet our happiness and honour, and makes all estates sweet. This would refresh us in the hardest labour; as they that carry the spices from Arabia are refreshed with the smell of them in their journey; and some observe, that it keeps their strength and frees them from fainting.”

⁸ Rom. iv. 11, 24,

But, as well as in the interpretation of the doctrine of the Trinity, very wide is the difference between the Evangelicals and the Ritualists on what is called the doctrine of APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION. The latter confidently affirm that the spiritual blessings of the Gospel are confined to the channel of an episcopally ordained ministry; that ministers not so ordained have no right to preach the Gospel, and cannot efficaciously administer the sacraments, let them be as holy as they may; that all who are episcopally ordained may do both, let them be as unholy as they will; and that accordingly Chalmers amongst the Presbyterians, or devoted missionaries like Williams and Moffatt amongst the Independents, were no true ministers of Christ, but that such men as Alexander Borgia of the Church of Rome, or the "bloody" Bonner of the Church of England, were. Hence some of the early tract writers go so far as to say:—

"The Christian congregations of the present day, who sit at the feet of ministers *duly ordained*, have the *same* reason for reverencing in them the successors of the Apostles, as the Primitive Churches of Ephesus and Crete had for honouring in Timothy and Titus the apostolic authority of him who had appointed them. . . . Why should we talk so little of an *Apostolic succession*? Why should we not seriously endeavour to impress our people with this plain truth, that by separating themselves from our communion, they separate themselves not only from a decent, orderly, useful society, but from *the only Church in this realm which has a right to be quite sure she has the Lord's body to give to His people.*" !!!⁹

Passing by the profanity of this antichristian sentiment, whether we consider the palpable absurdity involved in such a doctrine, its utter destitution of historic evidence, or the outrage it implies on all charity, it is equally revolting to every one who has a spark of the spirit of Him who said, "Come unto me; take my yoke upon you and learn of me, for I am meek and lowly in heart." We *feel* in our inmost souls that if there were nothing else to say, there is nothing more certain, whether it be of faith, or reason or science, that a dogma which consigns every non-Episcopalian, whether minister or layman, (embracing, by the way, fully three-fourths of the Christian world outside

⁹ *Tracts for the Times*, vol. i, 5, 11.

the Greek and Roman Churches,) should be consigned practically to what has been termed "the uncovenanted mercies of God," must be utterly alien to the Gospel of Jesus Christ; and therefore partaking of "that spirit of Antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is in the world."¹

The Evangelical naturally shrinks with horror from such a daring assumption of power, which the Ritualist does not hesitate to describe in the following terms:—

"I will suggest the consideration of the vastness of the power claimed by the Church—a power which places it almost on a level with God Himself—the power of forgiving sins by wiping them out in baptism—of transferring souls from hell to heaven, without admitting a doubt of it."²

But he cordially accepts this undoubted truth that the Episcopalian, Presbyterian, or Independent, who holds the essential doctrines of the Gospel, and is animated by its spirit, is a true member of the Church of Christ. He feels that the saying of Robert Hall commends itself at once to common sense, to the highest reason, and to the noblest instincts of our better nature, "he who is good enough for Christ is good enough for me."

Equally divergent are the views of Evangelicals and Ritualists respecting the efficacy of THE SACRAMENTS. We do not deny that the doctrine of "Baptismal Regeneration" is held by many who are far from approving of the Oxford movement. But the leaders and guides of this new school, in their consistent advocacy of sacerdotal principles, have carried out their views respecting baptism to the utmost verge of extravagance, as Dr. Pusey writes:—

"The Church has no second baptism to give, and so she cannot pronounce him (who sins after baptism) altogether free from his past sins. *There are but two periods of absolute cleansing, baptism and the day of judgment.*"³

Similar is their reasoning respecting the efficacy of the other sacrament, "the Lord's Supper." The change which takes place in the elements, when consecrated by an episcopally or-

¹ 1 John iv. 3.

² Sewell's *Christian Morals*, p. 247.

³ Dr. Pusey's *Letter to the Bishop of Oxford*, p. 93.

daind minister, termed by the Romanist "Transubstantiation," and which is the warrant to the Ritualist for his "Eucharistic adoration," is placed on a par with the first miracle which our Lord performed during His ministry on earth. "Is the wonder," asks a writer in one of their periodicals, "wrought at the marriage of Cana a miracle, *and the change which the holy elements undergo, as consecrated by the priest*, and received by the faithful, no miracle, simply because the one was perceptible to the natural eye, while the other is discerned by the spiritual alone?"⁴ Persons generally suppose that the very essence of a *miracle* consists in its appealing to the senses of those in whose presence it is wrought; and such appears to be the opinion of the genuine Romanist, as witness Dr. Newman's admission on this important subject:—

"Of the account of mediæval miracles, I said *there was no extravagance in their general character*; but I could not affirm there was always evidence for them. As to St. Walburga, I made one exception—the fact of the medicinal oil, since for that miracle there was distinct and successive testimony. The oil still flows; I have had some of it in my possession; it is medicinal; some think it is so by natural quality, others by a divine gift. *Perhaps it is on the confines of both.* . . . I think it is impossible to withstand the evidence which is brought for the liquefaction of the blood of St. Januarius, and for the motion of the eyes of the pictures of the Madonna in the Roman States. I believe that portions of the true cross are at Rome and elsewhere, that the crib of Bethlehem is at Rome, and the bodies of St. Peter and St. Paul also. Many men, when they hear an educated man so speak, will at once impute the avowal to insanity, or to an idiosyncrasy, or to imbecility of mind, or to decrepitude of powers, or to fanaticism, or to hypocrisy. They have a right to say so, if they will; and we have a right to ask them why they do not say it of those who bow down before the mystery of mysteries, the divine incarnation."⁵

⁴ *British Critic*, vol. 27, p. 260.

⁵ Newman's *Apologia*, App. pp. 43—57. The late Stanley Faber relates that Dr. Newman used to argue against the possibility of Rome being *idoltrous*, notwithstanding her worship of winking Madonnas, dead saints, and a wafer god, which the Church of England considers to be "Idolatry to be abhorred by all faithful Christians," in as logical a fashion as he reasons in behalf of mediæval miracles: "It is foretold," he says, "that under the Gospel dispensation, *the idols God shall utterly abolish.* (Isa. ii. 18.)

I have already said sufficient in the chapter on THE REAL PRESENCE respecting the non-miraculous nature of that sacred rite, to make any further allusion to it unnecessary; but inasmuch as the Ritualists contend very strongly in favour of the lawfulness of "Eucharistic adoration," I will adduce the testimony of two distinguished divines of different ages to show that such is nothing more or less than "the idolatry" which is so plainly condemned by the Reformed Church of England. Bishop Beveridge, when writing on this subject, fortifies his opinion with the authority of Gregory Nyssen, of the fourth century, by observing:—

"If the Primitive Church was against *the reservation*, surely it was *much more against the adoration of the Sacrament*, holding that no person or thing, under any pretence whatsoever, ought to be worshipped besides God. I know it is not bread our adversaries say they worship, but Christ in the bread, or the bread in the name of Christ. But I wish them to consider what Gregory Nyssen said long ago: 'He that worshippeth a creature, though he do it in the name of Christ, is *an idolater*, giving the name of Christ to an idol. And therefore let them not be angry at us for concluding them to be idolaters, whilst they eat one piece of bread and worship the other.'

I have before pointed out that our Church, in accordance with the faith of the Primitive Christians, teaches that the attempt to adore the sacramental bread and wine, as the Ritualists advocate, is "idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians;" and the reason why our Church very properly forbids this "Eucharistic adoration," is because "the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one." Our Church sets this forth in the plainest terms, in order to warn her faithful members against the antichristian doctrine, which St. John foretold would be accepted by many professing Christians, who

But if, under that dispensation, the Roman Church be idolatrous, then the idols have not been utterly abolished. Therefore the Roman Church cannot have been idolatrous." Q. E. D.! (Faber's *Provincial Letters*, p. 222.)

virtually deny the fact of Christ having already "come in the flesh." (2 John 7.) Therefore, those who assert, as Dr. Littledale and other advocates of the "real objective presence" do, (see p. 87,) that the same body which was crucified and is now in heaven is also present on the table at every celebration of the Lord's Supper, virtually deny that Christ had a true body of flesh such as ours, and such as Scripture says He took, (Heb. ii. 14,) and are consequently in the greatest danger from their tremendous error.

Although in the preceding chapters we have largely availed ourselves of the early Christian writers, or "fathers" as they are commonly termed, it must not for a moment be supposed that we can in anywise regard them in the same light as the advocates of the Oxford movement appear to do. In one of the early *Tracts for the Times* (No. 85) the writer argues that if the fathers appear to contradict one another, so do the Scriptures; and that if many of their statements are unintelligible and opposed to reason, there are many in the Scriptures equally so. And then it is added that if the Scriptures are nevertheless true, so may the system of "Church principles," deducible mainly from the later fathers, be no less true. But those who are well read in the "fathers" of all ages, know that the interval between the best of them and Holy Scripture is so immense, that they accept it as the most convincing proof of the inspired origin of the latter, it being contrary to all experience to suppose that a number of men could have composed such a volume as the Bible, when their immediate successors, many of them being undoubtedly learned men and with the advantage of such a model, could fall into puerilities so gross and errors so monstrous as many undoubtedly have done.

It has been well said that "the most cruel enemies of those good but greatly erring men, the fathers, are their modern idolaters; who, by exaggerating their claims, compel reasonable men to prove them unfounded." It is certain, however, that the fathers do not invest either themselves individually or the Church generally with the authority which their present

admirers would fain attribute to them. M. Daillé, in his valuable work on the fathers, observes :—

“ I am firmly of opinion that if these holy men could now behold from the mansions of the blessed what things are done here below, they would be very much offended by the honours which men confer upon them much against their wills. Or if from out of their sepulchres, where the relics of their mortality are now laid up, they could but make us hear their sacred voice, they would, I am very confident, most sharply reprove us for this abuse, and would cry out in the words of St. Paul, ‘Sirs, why do ye these things? We also were men of like passions with you.’ ”⁶

It may be well, however, as a general rule, to distinguish between the value to be attached to the testimony of the ante-Nicene fathers, who represent the opinions of the first three centuries, and those of a later age—*e.g.*, between the Epistles of Clemens Romanus to the Corinthians in the first century, and the writings of Jerome or Gregory of Nyssa, the biographer of his more celebrated namesake, commonly called *Thaumaturgus*, “the miracle-monger,” in the fourth century, when the Church was fast lapsing into the apostasy predicted by the Apostle Paul. Nothing, however, can be clearer than the testimony borne by St. Augustine, as we have already seen, as to the supremacy of Holy Scripture, and the right of private judgment on all matters pertaining to the faith—that the Christian is not required to examine Scripture by the fathers, but the fathers by Scripture. Just as the BEREANS were commended by the inspired writer for testing the preaching of the Apostles by the only infallible guide to truth—“These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so.”⁷

It is on this point, as on so many others, that the Evangelicals and Ritualists are directly at issue. The latter mix tradition with Scripture, and deny to others virtually the right of private judgment, though they largely exercise it themselves, inasmuch

⁶ Daillé, *On the Right Use of the Fathers*, b. ii. c. ii.

⁷ Acts xvii. 11.

as they declare their ideal "Church to be the sole interpreter of Scripture, and that they constitute "the Church." Whereas the former, faithful to the example of the Primitive Christians in the case of the "noble Bereans," and to the teaching of our favoured branch of Christ's Church, utterly reject every thing which may interfere with the only infallible guide which God has been pleased to give man to guide him on his way to heaven; and, consequently, they regard the testimony of the fathers, even of the best and earliest, only so far as it accords with the plain teaching of God's word. For thus the Church of England, in her Articles, rightly declares:—

"Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation." (Art. VI.)

There are many other great and insuperable differences between Evangelicals and Ritualists besides those already mentioned, such as the power of the priest,⁸ the doctrine "of reserve," the mode of a sinner's "justification" in the sight of an all-righteous God, &c., which it is not necessary to dwell upon here. It will be sufficient if we remember that the cardinal point on which all our differences may be said to hinge and turn is the question, *whether we are to stand by the principles of the Reformation*, and to be ready to give our lives in their defence if called upon so to do; or *whether we are*, as our Ritualistic brethren frankly avow, *to do all that lies in our power to "unprotestantize the Church of England"*—to assert our unity "in faith, orders, and sacraments" with the Papacy, and to plead for eventual corporate union with the Church of Rome.

⁸ The growth of "priestcraft," for which the Ritualists are now striving so hard, received a great impetus in the fourth century from Martin, Bishop of Tours, who is said to have converted many heathen in Gaul by his "miracles," and who himself taught that "the dignity of a priest was so great that the Emperor of Rome was inferior to one of that order!" (Sulpitius Severus' *De Vitâ Martini*, cap. xx.) Contrast such teaching with that of the Apostle Paul to the Primitive Christians of the first century!

The Oxford movement is not the first attempt that has been made to undo the work of the Reformation of the sixteenth century. The movement, which commenced with the incoming of the Stuarts at the beginning of the seventeenth century, was of a precisely similar tendency as that of the Ritualistic party in the present day; though with this difference—they were restrained from boldly avowing, as their successors have done, that their intention was to amalgamate eventually with the Church of Rome. Nevertheless, there is ample proof that “the Oxford movement” so perfectly resembles the sacerdotal acts and principles of Archbishop Laud, in the days of James I. and Charles I., that it must be considered as a fresh instance of history repeating itself. That it was so regarded by our ancestors, who laid the foundation of England’s freedom by their noble stand against the unbridled tyranny of the Stuarts, we may conclude, from the following extract of a speech made by the young and gifted Lord Falkland to the House of Commons, A.D. 1640, in which he drew a graphic picture of the sacerdotal party amongst the clergy of the Church of England at that period, who appear to be a perfect type of their Ritualistic successors in the present day. These are Lord Falkland’s words:—

“It seemed their work was to try how much of a *Papist* might be brought in *without Popery*; and to destroy as much as they could of the *Gospel* without bringing themselves into danger of being destroyed by the law.

“Mr. Speaker,—To go yet further, some of them have so industriously laboured to deduce themselves from *Rome*, that they have given great suspicion that in gratitude they desire *to return* thither, or at least to meet it half way. Some have evidently laboured to bring in an *English*, though not a *Roman*, *Popery*: I mean, not only the *outside* and *dress* of it, but equally absolute, a *blind dependence of the people upon the clergy, and of the clergy upon themselves*, and have opposed the *Papacy* beyond the *seas*, that they might settle *one beyond the water*; nay, common fame is more than ordinarily false, if none of them have found a way to reconcile the opinions of *Rome* to the preferments of England; and to be so absolutely, directly, and cordially *Papist*, that it is all that £1500 a year can do to keep them from confessing it.”⁹

⁹ Rushworth’s *Historical Collections*, vol. i. part iii.

If such be the tendency of both movements of the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries, as the Ritualistic party of the present day are never tired of avowing, viz., to bring us eventually into subjection to the apostate Church of Rome, no language can be too severe in condemnation of those who are alike traitors to their God, their Church, and their country. And inasmuch as the authorised teaching of the Reformed Church of England is of a distinctly opposite nature, as Dr. Wordsworth, the present Bishop of Lincoln, has justly observed, "The Church of England, among all the Churches of Christendom, has the special advantage of being *Catholic* in the true sense of the term, *and also Protestant*,"¹ it becomes all true Protestant members of the Church to promote a much greater intercommunion with other Reformed Churches than has hitherto been the case. Our insular position, together with the sacerdotal spirit which has unhappily leavened too much of our Church since the days of Laud, has prevented that intercommunion with the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, on the one hand, and all other Nonconformist Churches, which are equally entitled with ourselves to the name of "Catholic" according to the ancient canon, as worshipping the Unity in Trinity and the Trinity in Unity, on the other. The time was when the Church of England recognised more openly the Church of Scotland as a sister-branch of the Catholic Church than some of her members are disposed now to allow; as may be seen in the Canons of 1604, in which there is contained the following form of prayer to be used by all preachers before their sermons:—

"Ye shall pray for Christ's holy Catholic Church, that is, *for the whole congregation of Christian people*, (Episcopalian or otherwise,) dispersed throughout the whole world, and especially for the Churches of *England, Scotland, and Ireland*," &c. (*Canon 55.*)

I am aware that a strenuous effort is being made by the sacerdotal party in the present day to deny both the term "Catholic" to any but Episcopalians, and that the "Church of

¹ Diocesan Conference at Lincoln, reported in *Guardian*, Sept. 30, 1874.

Scotland" means the present Presbyterian Established Church of Christ in North Britain. Persons who can so argue scarce deserve a reply, for the language of the canon is so plain that it betrays a limited acquaintance with the history of the time, as well as an animus towards non-Episcopalian Catholics, which is alike unworthy of the members of a Church whose fundamental rule is that Scripture is alone Infallible and Supreme.

And although it requires great caution to accept in its literal sense the following statement in the Preface to the Ordination Service of the Book of Common Prayer—

"It is evident unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that *from the Apostles' time* there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church—bishops, priests, and deacons,"

inasmuch as the weight of evidence is against what is commonly called "Episcopacy" being of apostolic origin,² though doubtless it came into existence as early as the second century, and, as most Evangelical members of the Church of England generally admit, is necessary to the "well-being," though not to the "being," of any branch of the Catholic Church,—God forbid we should refuse to recognise non-Episcopalian Churches as branches of Christ's flock as true as our own.

We may remark that the historical evidence of the Church of Scotland being under Presbyterian, and not Episcopalian,

² This subject is fully discussed in Canon Lightfoot's admirable work on *The Epistle to the Philippians*; in which he proves conclusively that in the early Primitive Church, *i.e.*, of the first century, there could not have been the three separate orders as exist now amongst Episcopalians, because bishops and presbyters were then identical. He writes:—"It is the conception of a later age which represents Timothy as Bishop of Ephesus, and Titus as Bishop of Crete. . . . As late as the year 70 no distinct signs of Episcopal government have hitherto appeared in Gentile Christendom." (pp. 197, 199.) Bishop Tozer's unchristian complaint to the Protestant Bishop of New York, on account of the Dean of Canterbury having communicated in a Presbyterian church at the time of the Session of the Evangelical Alliance in that city, sufficiently displays the animus of the Ritualistic mind on this point.

government at the time when the canons of the Church of England were drawn up in 1604, is simply conclusive. Having been led to enter into controversy with Chancellor Harrington on this very point upwards of twenty years ago, I had occasion to investigate the subject somewhat closely, and was surprised as well as pleased to find so much evidence both from the Episcopalian, as well as the Presbyterian, standpoint in favour of my opinion. Time and further investigation have confirmed the view I then entertained, and, strange to say, amid the host of witnesses which I discovered who adopted this view, one of the most decided was my friendly opponent Chancellor Harrington himself, as in one of his works he says:—

“The Presbyterian Church was established by an act for ‘abolishing the acts contrary to the true religion,’ June 5th, 1592. From the year 1560 to 1610, the various appointments in the Church were *unconnected with any Episcopal ordination*, but after fifty years’ confusion the succession of Episcopacy was restored in 1610.”³

As Chancellor Harrington admits, there was no Episcopal ordination in the Church of Scotland from 1560 to 1610, and though he is pleased to term that half-century “years of confusion,” it is manifest, according to his own admission, that during the period when the canons of 1604 were passed recognizing the Church of Scotland as a true branch of the Church Catholic, she was governed by presbyters and not by bishops. I recollect once hearing of an astute Ritualist, who contended that the language of the canon only implied that we were invited to pray for the Christians then living in Scotland, and that it might be paralleled by supposing that if Charles II., when in exile, had commanded prayers to be offered for the English nation, it did not prove that he recognised the government of Oliver Cromwell!!! Such an illustration—I am unable to call it an argument—is only to be paralleled by Dr. Newman’s attempt to whitewash the Church of Rome from the sin of idolatry, or Dr. Manning’s bolder assertion of the angelic nature, with but

³ Chancellor Harrington’s *Brief Notes on the Church of Scotland*, from 1555 to 1842, pp. 8—10,

few exceptions, of the long line of reigning Popes, but will hardly be accepted by any one who is capable of applying a few grains of common sense to the subject in question.

As if, moreover, to show how utterly futile is the reasoning of those who would deny Christianity,⁴ or something very like it, to the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, we have evidence that such was not the view of the High Church Bancroft, who, as Bishop of London, was President of the Convocation which passed the canons of 1604, and who subsequently became Archbishop of Canterbury and Primate of the Church of England; for in the year 1610, when the Episcopal form of government become again dominant in Scotland, and certain presbyters came to England to be consecrated bishops, their previous Presbyterian ordination was recognised by Archbishop Bancroft as valid and lawful; and it is interesting for those who are honestly "Protestant" to see the reason of this recognition. Spottiswood, in his *History of the Church of Scotland*, gives the following account of the transaction:—

"A question, in the meantime, was moved by Dr. Andrewes, Bishop of Ely, touching the consecration of the Scottish bishops, who, as he said, 'must first be ordained presbyters, as having received no ordination from a bishop.' The Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Bancroft, who was by, maintained, 'that thereof there was no necessity, seeing, *where bishops could not be had, the ordination given by the presbyters must be esteemed lawful*: otherwise, that it might be doubted if there were any lawful vocation in most of the Reformed Churches.' This was agreed to by the other bishops, Ely acquiesced, and at the day, and in the place appointed, the three Scottish bishops were consecrated."⁵

If any one wishes to see the subject learnedly considered and fully discussed, I would refer him to Dr. Harrison's *Whose are*

⁴ This odious and utterly unfounded charge is frequently made by the organs of the Ritualistic press. To quote one specimen out of many, I read in the *Church Review* of January 30th, 1875, that "the Ritualists are now the *sole defenders* of revealed truth. For to all intents and purposes the Evangelicals and the Broad Churchmen are united in their action against *all definite Christian faith and practice*." !!!

⁵ Spottiswood, book vii. p. 514.

the Fathers? chapter v., where the matter is treated with marked ability, and Dean Hook's antagonism to the Church of Scotland exposed with not undue severity, as Dr. Harrison good-naturedly says that "the dean's common sense must for the moment have left him on some roving commission," when he "advances from what he calls *à priori* reasoning to what he designates history." At all events, it must be satisfactory to every one who is taught of God, and who believes the Church of England to be a favoured branch of the Church of Christ, to see that she recognises non-Episcopalian bodies to be as true Churches as herself. When it is remembered how small a portion of reformed Christendom acknowledges Episcopacy to be the best form of government—certainly not one-third in point of numbers—it behoves every Evangelical to do all that lies in his power to promote the union between Episcopalians and non-Episcopalians which is so desirable, and we may add, so necessary at this time in the present distress.

In the beginning of this work I had occasion to call attention to the great advantage which would accrue to the Church of England if she encouraged more intercommunion with Protestant Churches, especially in interchange of pulpits, than at present exists. Now although a clergyman might occupy the pulpit of any brother-minister amongst Nonconformists, with spiritual profit to both, and we rejoice to see that recently this has been done by several clergy in different parts of the country,⁶ a clergyman is precluded by *law* from inviting a

⁶ It is melancholy to think of the conduct of the Bishop of London in prohibiting Mr. Fremantle from preaching at Dr. Parker's church in London, as was done in the first week of February, 1875; especially after the bishop's unhappy patronage of such Ritualists as Mr. Berdmore Compton and others of the same school. In this instance, however, the Bishop of London has been far exceeded by his brother of Lincoln in unwisdom and the lack of that Christian charity which is so delightful to see exhibited, especially by the lordly prelate towards the humblest of Christ's ministers. But Bishop Wordsworth's conduct in the matter of refusing to concede the courtesy title of "Rev." to a pious Wesleyan minister, who sought permission to have it recorded on the tombstone of a beloved child, not only shows how completely blind he is to the spirit of Christianity, but proves how fatal the bar

Nonconformist minister to occupy his own in return, just as much as he is precluded by *grace* from worshipping in any of those Ritualistic churches which nominally belong to the Establishment, but which are alike nurseries for, and feeble imitations of, the worst excesses of the idolatrous and apostate Church of Rome.

Mr. Gladstone has recently done good service to the Protestant Church in calling attention to the extreme folly of those ultra-Ritualists, who imagine they are going to undo the work of the Reformation in their insane and treacherous longing after the Papacy. His position as the greatest statesman of the day is so important, his talents are of such a superior order, and his knowledge of Rome's crafty attempt upon England's welfare is so great, that we do well to bear in mind Mr. Gladstone's weighty words, which it is not too much to say have sent a thrill of joy throughout Christendom, as they have offended and alarmed his quondam allies the Papists throughout the world; and which show that he has taken a just measure of the evil designs of the Papacy against the happiness and welfare of England. Mr. Gladstone says on this point:—

“The question is whether a handful of the clergy are or are not engaged in an utterly hopeless and visionary effort to Romanise the Church and people of England. At no time since the bloody reign of Mary has such a scheme been possible. But if it had been possible in the seventeenth or eighteenth centuries, it would still have become impossible in the nineteenth; when Rome has substituted for the proud boast of *semper eadem* a policy of violence and change in faith; when she has refurbished and paraded anew every rusty tool she was fondly thought to have disused; when no one can become her convert without renouncing his moral and mental freedom, and placing his civil loyalty and duty on another; and when she has equally repudiated modern thought and ancient history, I cannot persuade myself to feel alarm as to the final issue of her crusades in England; and this although I do not undervalue her great powers of mischief.”⁷

this love of sacerdotalism must be to any attempt at union with our Nonconformist brethren, which is so much to be desired by all who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity and truth.

⁷ Mr. Gladstone's article on *Ritualism and Ritual*, in the *Contemporary Review*, October, 1874, p. 674. In his subsequent pamphlet on *The Vatican Decrees*, Mr. Gladstone has fully substantiated, by a masterly analysis of

A long-continued study of the writings of the Primitive Christians, and a comparison of their doctrines and practices with those of the sacerdotal party in our Church at the present time, has slowly and sadly convinced the writer of this work that the differences in spiritual things between the Evangelicals and the ultra-Ritualists are too numerous to be detailed, and too deep to be overcome. And it is not a little significant that on the various points, amounting to nearly fifty in number, decided by the Supreme Ordinary in the two cases of *Martin v. Mackonochie*, and *Hebbert v. Purchas*, almost all of them were decided in favour of the Evangelicals, and consequently against the Ritualists; which must be considered as conclusive testimony that the former are the true representatives of the Reformed Church of England, and that the latter are, as indeed they so often and with such frankness declare, doing all they can to prepare the people of England for returning to the allegiance of Rome. Nothing perhaps has proved their extreme disloyalty to the Church of England more than the Christian revilings which the organs of the Ritualistic press are in the constant habit of pouring out upon those who happen to differ from them, whether their superiors, their equals, or their inferiors, and notably upon the bishops and rulers of the Church, to whom they ought in common decency, and in remembrance of their profession as Christians, to pay at least some slight tokens of respect. But we confidently appeal to any honest and candid man of any party, who has made himself acquainted with their writings, to say whether we have overstated the very grave charge which we bring against the ultra-Ritualists on this head alone. We have scores and scores of passages from their recognised organs to this effect, but it will be sufficient if we

the arts and devices of the Church Rome, the very serious charges which he brings against that apostate community, against which the kings of the earth are now happily directing their strength, in exact fulfilment of the prophetic word, which declared that they would "hate the whore, (of Babylon the Great,) and make her desolate and naked, and eat her flesh, and burn her with fire. For God hath put it into their hearts to fulfil His will," (Rev. xvii. 16, 17.)

adduce two witnesses, in order to show the interpretation which the Ritualistic press places upon the apostolic prohibition against "speaking evil of dignities." Thus on the occasion of the introduction of the Archbishop of Canterbury's bill, for the better regulation of public worship, into the House of Commons, the *Church Herald* of July 15th, 1874, spoke of the primate in the following terms:—

"Mr. Gladstone's opportunity was prepared for him by the Orange bunglers, whose dense stupidity and owlish blindness would be ballast enough to sink any rational cause. His speech must have been gall and wormwood to the Bishop of Gloucester, who sat smirking and admiring himself in the Peers' gallery. The clergy have been largely alienated from the Tories by Dr. Tait's odious bill—the blundering, bungling and floundering bill of the purblind Archbishop . . . Archbishop Tait lectures and hectors his suffragans with pompous and rude expostulations, scarcely allowing them to maintain that their souls are their own. The cringing, abject, contemptible, slave-spirited manner in which they lick the dust of the feet of this Scotch Erastian and northern adventurer, is a sight to make *the devils rejoice and angels weep*. That the bill should become law this year is *clearly impossible*. The only *high-class* papers which have *successfully opposed the bill on principle* have been the *Morning Post*, the *Church Herald*, (*i.e.*, ourselves,) and the *Saturday Review*."

If such be the permitted language of "high-class" Ritualistic journals, what must be that of a lower grade? Nor is the *Church Times* very far behind its contemporary in "speaking evil of dignities," as the following brief extracts will show:—

"The *Queen's* ostentatious Nonconformity, and her scarcely less ostentatious slights to the Church of England, have deprived her example of any religious weight with Churchmen." (Jan. 2, 1874.)

"With many of *the bishops*, we doubt not, a desire of personal ease is at the bottom of their action against Ritualism . . . Some of their lordships argue thus with themselves: '*The Evangelical party is so malignant and relentless, that my only chance of quiet, my only hope of escaping virulent enmity, is to yield to its demands, and deliver the Ritualists to be crucified.*'" (Oct. 31, 1873.)

"When Dr. Ellicott and Dean Law (the Bishop and Dean of Gloucester) are discrediting their whole faction by dealing with the interests of the Church as if it were a Christmas pantomime, and *they severally clown and pantaloons*, burning their own fingers with the hot poker they intend for the police, we can have little to complain of the way our opponents, religious and irreligious alike, are acting." (Jan. 2, 1874.)

“We have had much pleasure in studying the reports of the Wolverhampton meeting, (of the Church Association,) which show us *the drunken Helots of Puritanism in full debauch*, and serve as a beacon to all decent folk to warn them from such companionship.” (Dec. 5, 1873.)

“*Protestantism*, besides being the religion of unbelief, has also from its earliest origin been *the religion of unchastity*. The secret sects which were its feeders before the Reformation were sinks of profligacy. The difference between sins of impurity in Protestant and (Roman) Catholic countries^s is this, that (Roman) Catholicism recognises their sinfulness, as matter of religion and as matter of law; but Protestantism, by civilly legalizing them, pretends to treat them as morally unobjectionable.” (March 7, 1873.)

“Our martyred Reformers are described as ‘*the profane and immoral levellers of the sixteenth century* ;’ men whose characters and motives cannot stand the test of historical criticism, cowardly traitors like Cranmer; coarse, illiterate persecuting bullies, like Latimer; hardened and shameless liars, like Bale;

^s In reply to this accusation of the *Church Times* against Protestantism, we may quote facts and figures on unquestionable authority which entirely *reverse* the picture which that journal has painted of the comparative sinlessness of Roman Catholic countries. In the late Hobart Seymour’s valuable work on the *Confessional*, there is a careful comparison of various vices made on the authority of governmental returns, by which we may learn the proportion which criminals in Protestant England bear to those in Roman Catholic countries on the Continent.

Thus in England murders were at the rate of 4 to the million.

Ireland	„	„	19	„
France	„	„	31	„
Austria	„	„	36	„
Italy	„	„	78	„
The Papal States	„	„	187	„ !!!

This latter return of course refers to the condition of the Papal States before its happy union with the kingdom of Italy; but think of that paradise, as Dr. Manning would term it, when the whole government was in the hands of the priests, affording such a hecatomb as 187 murders to every million of souls, while poor benighted Protestant England could only attain to the number of 4 to every million!

So as regards the number of *illegitimate births*, compare cities of Protestant England with cities of Roman Catholic countries in Europe.

Thus in London the rate is 4 per cent. In Milan 32 per cent.

Plymouth	„	5	„	Brussels	35	„
Liverpool	„	6	„	Munich	48	„
Manchester	„	7	„	Vienna	51	„
Exeter	„	8	„	Gratz	65	„

Look on this picture and on that!

these are hard words, no doubt, but not one-tenth so hard as the deeds which make them deserved." (Jan. 5, 1867.)

"The Rev. William Grisley, one of the early leaders in the Oxford movement, thus speaks of the language which the chief journal of his party thinks fit to employ towards those who differ from it. In a letter to the *Church Review* of March 2, 1867, he says:—

"Turn we now to the *Church Times*. I will not express my opinion respecting it, but simply quote from its pages. I have by chance two or three numbers by me. The first I glance at is that of Feb. 2, 1867. I turn to the leading article, *Habemus confidentem rerum*. The following are some of the expressions which I find in *one article* applied to their opponents: 'rancorous malignity,' 'ferocious counsel,' 'malice and bigotry,' 'cant, stupidity, and malevolent lies and slanders,' 'pious slanderer,' 'self-convicted calumniator,' 'shameless vituperator,' 'literary exponent of all that is narrow-minded, spiteful and contemptible.'"

It would be quite useless to make any reply to such a specimen of Ritualistic Billingsgate, as the editor of the *Church Times* is evidently of the pachyderm order, and any attempt to remind him that the disciple of Christ should remember the words of Him who hath said, "*Learn of me, for I am meek and lowly in heart*," would be quite thrown away upon one who sets all Christian principle at defiance; but we may adduce the testimony of the *Quarterly Review* as to the effect which such language must necessarily produce upon those who are outside our ecclesiastical troubles:—

"The press has poured forth a flood of ultra-Ritualistic literature, of which some specimens are named in the heading of our article; and, objectionable as these works appear to us in many ways, the worst of them give but little idea of the *vulgarity and scurrility*, the *venomous malice* and the *unscrupulous falsehood* which have won for the newspapers of this party a pre-eminence in badness over the most disreputable of our older 'religious' papers."⁹

Although these words were penned previous to the date of some of the extracts from the *Church Times* given above, it is manifest that its later effusions are equally antichristian as those of an earlier date. With regard to the passage we

⁹ *Quarterly Review*, Jan. 1869, pp. 134, 5.

have given from the *Church Herald*, the violence of whose language may be considered as a suitable counterpoise to the weakness of the arguments employed, it is a curious fact that on the very day on which it declared that it was "clearly impossible" the Public Worship Bill could pass, the second reading in the House of Commons took place without a division; Mr. Gladstone's six resolutions were silently withdrawn; and the Act speedily became the law of the land.

As a fitting climax to the opinion of the *Church Herald* respecting the Public Worship Bill, *The Pall Mall Gazette*, of Dec. 10th, 1874, publishes the following statement, made by Mr. Temple West, a London clergyman of ultra-Ritualistic tendency, noted for his disloyalty,¹ and, alas! that we should be compelled to add, for his disregard of truth likewise. At a meeting of the *English Church Union, West London District*, this Rev. R. Temple West spoke as follows on the subject before us:—

"One of the incidents in the secret history of the Public Worship Bill was curiously significant. After the defeat of his attempt to rescind the appeal to the archbishops which the Commons had inserted in the measure,

¹ At the time of the Prince of Wales' dangerous illness, when prayers ascended up on high from multitudes of such different languages and creeds, the Rev. R. T. West, who has a church at Paddington, made himself conspicuous for his disobedience and disloyalty by refusing to use the prayers appointed by authority on the prince's behalf, because, as he contemptuously designated them, they were "the Privy Council prayers!" though in truth they were prepared by the Bishop of London and the Archbishop of the province, and the sentences, full of kindness and love, were gathered from the Book of Common Prayer. Even the *Guardian* admitted Mr. West's conduct was indefensible, and reproved him accordingly. In a similar spirit, at the time of the delivery of the *Purchas* judgment, Mr. West encouraged the criminal to set at defiance the powers that be upon the false plea that it was an "invasion of a secular court upon the spiritual functions of a priest;" either conveniently forgetting or entirely ignorant of the fact that it was not the judgment of a secular court, but of her whose judgment in all *spiritual* causes Mr. Temple West, like every other clergyman, had solemnly sworn to obey; but he, like so many other ultra-Ritualists, appears to be quite ready to fling his ordination vows to the winds, if they conflict with the opinions formed from their own perverted private judgment.

Mr. Gladstone went to the Bishops of Ely and Winchester, and told them ‘if this question as to the archbishops is carried, then I am perfectly free as to Disestablishment.’ Of course, this alarmed the bishops, and urgent telegrams were sent to the absent members of the Episcopate, ‘Come up and vote on the appeal—Disestablishment touched by it.’”

On this extraordinary statement appearing in print, the Bishop of Winchester, and other bishops, wrote at once to the public journals simply to state that it was “untrue.”² But it was reserved for the Bishop of Peterborough to reply to this reverend slanderer of the bishops of the Church to which he professes to belong, in a way which, it is to be hoped, will effectually prevent him from ever appearing again in public as the “accuser of his brethren.” The Bishop of Peterborough closes his correspondence with Mr. R. T. West with these significant words:—

“I have only, in concluding our correspondence, to express my sincere regret that a clergyman of your character and standing in our Church should have placed himself *in the humiliating position* of having made a *public accusation, couched in studiously offensive terms, which he had neither the ability to prove nor the candour to withdraw.*”

Believing Mr. Temple West to be a true representative of the ultra-Ritualistic party, whose idiosyncracies may be described in brief as disloyal to the Crown, disrespectful to their spiritual superiors, and utterly opposed to all “Primitive and Catholic” truth, we sum up, in conclusion, the vital and fundamental differences between the expressed principles of the two chief schools of religious thought as existing in our Church in the present day.

The abiding principle of the Evangelical school is to treat the work of the ministry, as St. Paul described himself as doing in the first chapter of I Corinthians; viz., to make *preaching* everything, and to treat what are called “the Sacraments” after the manner of the heathen, as of secondary consideration. St. Paul never would have declared respecting “preaching” what he

* The Bishop of Winchester subsequently wrote to say that his “contradiction of one portion of Mr. West’s narrative was too unqualified, though on the general question his impressions were fully confirmed.”

does respecting "baptism." He thanked God that he "baptized none save Crispus and Gaius and the household of Stephanas;" whereas, on the other hand, he boasts that Christ sent him "not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel; not with wisdom of words, lest the cross of Christ should be made of none effect." And this is the mainstay of the Evangelical system, its advocates ever bearing in mind the declaration of the infallible Word, that *preaching*, and not sacerdotalism, is "the power of God," and that "it pleased God by the foolishness of *preaching* to save them that believe."

Whereas, on the other hand, the sacramental, or sacerdotal system is so overlaid with forms and ceremonies of human device, and not of God—with crossing and bowings and genuflexions—"posture and imposture," as it has been wittily, but too truly said—that either preaching is ignored altogether, or else it is made to assume a very different position in the Ritualistic economy from what it does in the unerring Word of God. The sacramental system, as now attempted to be carried out by our Ritualistic brethren, is nothing more or less than an endeavour to supplant "the ministers of the New Testament" of apostolic times by an order of sacrificing "priests" after the manner of the Jews, which under the old dispensation was commanded by God, and therefore at that time honest and just and true. And this attempt on the part of the Ritualists to return to Jewish ordinances, like the weak Peter at Antioch, when Paul, better taught in the truth of Evangelical religion, "withstood him to the face because he was to be blamed," has no support whatever even from the customs of the old dispensation; for Romanists and Romanizers alike admit that the "Eucharistic sacrifice," as they term it, was essentially an "unbloody" one, whereas it is quite clear from Scripture that "it is *the blood* which maketh an atonement for the soul," (Levit. xvii. 11,) and that "without shedding of blood is no remission." (Heb. ix. 22.) Moreover, as the Jewish altar was made for *burning*, and nothing that was laid on it was ever taken off, except in the form of *ashes*, it is manifest that the elements of bread and wine on the Lord's table have nothing

whatever to do with that vain and uncatholic conceit of the Ritualists, miscalled "the Eucharistic sacrifice."

Ritualism, or sacerdotalism, for they mean the same thing, is in reality nothing more or less than "idolatry" and "priestcraft," veiled under the misleading and high-sounding terms of "the Catholic Faith;" and which, in the estimation of all true Christians, is quite as dangerous, and far more mischievous, than the time-worn pretensions of the Church of Rome herself. No future relaxation of the present laws of our Church can divest "idolatry" of its heinousness. Legalized idolatry does not cease to be abominable in the sight of God. At the Reformation England "turned from dumb idols to serve the living and true God," and the nation is now happily aroused "at the hopeless attempt," as Mr. Gladstone has justly termed it, of a handful of unfaithful clergy³ trying to bring our Church back to communion with that apostate power, which is described in Revelation as THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH!

Let us, however, never forget that it is not the mere fact of making "preaching" the cardinal point of the Evangelical system, in contradistinction to the sacerdotal theory of the Ritualists, as it is the faithfulness of the message which we have to give, and the way by which it may best be delivered. St. Augustine has a quaint illustration of the various ways by which preaching Christ is accomplished, though all tending to the same blessed end. He says, that though the waters of a fountain may come from different shaped heads, one like that of an angel and another like that of a beast, the water equally refreshes the weary traveller—not because it comes from such a source, but because it is water. Our high function is to give

³ These "unfaithful clergy," whose faces are set Romewards, may be fitly compared to that band of "more than forty" conspirators who attempted to assassinate the Apostle Paul, because he "worshipped the God of his fathers in the way they called heresy," (Acts xxiii. 21;) as we have seen how our martyred Reformers and their true disciples are subject to every species of calumny, from those who avow their determination to "unprotestantize the Church of England."

the water of life *in all its purity*; to preach Christ and Him crucified in His person, His work, and His office, with the combined attractive power of the diamond and the loadstone, which the Holy Ghost alone can give, and which, like the lightning when it rends the oak, effectually enters the dark chambers of imagery in the sinner's soul, and brings down his idols to the ground. As a Chinese convert to the Gospel once happily remarked in conversation with a missionary, "We want men with *hot hearts* to tell us of the love of Christ." This is what may be considered as experimental preaching of the highest order, when the preacher gives forth the testimony he has realized in his own soul, of the exceeding sinfulness of sin, and the exceeding preciousness of salvation solely by faith in the blood of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. Such experimental preaching has been truly described to be *as deep as the soul of God*. An anecdote on record will afford a good illustration of the power of experimental preaching. It is related of an English merchant, who having occasion to visit Scotland in the year 1650, was asked on his return what he had heard. To which he replied, "Rare things. I went to St. Andrew's, where I heard a majestic-looking man, (Blair;) and he showed me *the majesty of God*. After him, I heard a little fair man, (Rutherford;) and he showed me *the loveliness of Christ*. I then went to Irvine, where I heard an old man, (Dickson;) and that man showed me *my own heart*."

As well as preaching from the heart to the heart, the Evangelical has to preach the expulsive power of the new affection, and to teach that the Spirit is the sole efficient supplanter of the love of the world and the things of this world in which fallen man so naturally delights. For our new "life is hid with Christ with God," says the infallible Word. It is not, therefore, sufficient to preach detachment from the world, unless an object of attachment is presented at the same time to supply its place. Attachment ranks first in the scale; detachment follows after. Like the cell, in which the butterfly is imprisoned, does not burst and crumble away until the wings, which are formed on the insect inside, expand and open its dark

dwelling; so the religion of the Evangelical believer, whose life is wrapped up in Christ, is not merely a religion of detachment from this world of sin and sorrow, but of attachment to Him who is "the Way, the Truth, and the Life." Hence the Evangelical, faithful to his calling, in delivering the message of love from God to man, and in the execution of his duty as an ambassador beseeching sinners to be reconciled with God, necessarily insists upon this fundamental truth, not merely that the foundation of his *title* to heaven is securely laid in heartfelt belief on the finished work of Christ, but also that he possesses, through the power of the Holy Ghost renewed day by day, and faithfully acting upon his awakened and penitent soul, a personal *meetness* for "the inheritance of the saints in light."

Cordially echoing the language adopted by the Evangelical brethren, in their Invitation to Members of the Church of England for the Conference held in London during the month of February, 1875—"There are surely richer experiences attainable by us all, a deeper devotedness to God, a brighter conformity to the image of our Lord Jesus Christ, a more careful walk in the Spirit, a more tender love for the brethren, a more intense longing for the salvation of men, a more earnest looking for the coming of the Lord"—I would close this Work on *The Primitive and Catholic Faith*, which I venture to think is both suitable and necessary for these present ominous times, in the words of that great master in Israel, whose well-known "Confessions" have afforded such comfort and instruction to believers of all ages and all climes, "O GOD, THOU HAST FORMED US FOR THYSELF, AND OUR HEARTS ARE RESTLESS UNTIL THEY REST IN THEE." AMEN.

APPENDIX.

A. PAGE 71.

The *Manchester Examiner* of January 30, 1875, records an instance of a clergyman seeking to enforce doctrines which the Church characterises as “blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.” It appears that the churchwardens of the Cathedral at Manchester felt it their duty to inform the bishop that in a sermon preached there on January 10 by Canon Woodard, “*the doctrine of the mass was preached without any reservation.*” On this complaint, the bishop invited Canon Woodard to submit his sermon to his diocesan’s inspection. This the canon, with that moral cowardice which is so marked a feature in the sacerdotal party, and conscious, as we must conclude, that his teaching was essentially non-primitive and uncatholic, absolutely refused to do, so that the bishop had the mortification of having to inform the churchwardens that he had “no power to compel him to do an act which might have the effect of *criminating* himself.” Although the bishop endeavours to defend his guilty brother upon the plea, that “he has never attempted to conceal that he is a High Churchman of a pronounced type,” this fact only convicts the canon of flagrant inconsistency. His party are perpetually raising indignant protests against the chains in which the Church is said by them to be held; but the moment they are charged with preaching heretical doctrine, in place of yielding cheerful and ready acquiescence in every reasonable wish of their ecclesiastical superiors, they avail themselves of every loophole to prevent the law from deciding whether the charge be true or false. No minister of Christ with a spark of conscious honesty would behave in such a way. The *Examiner* well remarks, that “the veriest Erastian that ever breathed could do nothing worse than flout his spiritual superior with the maxim of Cæsar’s court, and tell him in effect that he must be left to his legal remedies. Yet this is what Canon Woodard has not scrupled to do. Insubordination is contagious. The example set by a dignitary of the Church is likely to find imitators.” There is too much reason to fear that the Ritualistic clergy of the present day fall under the condemnation pronounced by Clement of Rome in the first century against a party in the Church of Corinth who were guilty of “that shameful and detestable sedition, utterly abhorrent to the elect of God, which a few rash and self-confident persons have kindled to such a pitch of frenzy,” in

striking contrast to the faithful who were famed, he says, for their "godliness in Christ, and their willing obedience to those who have the rule over you." (*Clem. Rom.*, 1 Ep. to Cor., ch. i.)

As it is possible that Canon Woodard's sermon, if published, would be found to contain the same line of defence which Dr. Pusey has attempted of making a distinction between "mass" and "masses," referred to at page 71 of this work, we should remember that such was *not* the way which Dr. Newman acted, when defending a similar line of argument in his defence of Tract No. XC., as he says in his *Letter to Dr. Jelf*, published in 1841, "As to *the mass*, all that impairs or obscures the doctrine of the one atonement once offered, which *masses*, as observed in the Church of Rome, *actually have done*."

B. PAGE 114.

In quoting Edward the Sixth's *first* Prayer Book of 1549, I have omitted to notice the fact, that the rubric belonging to the Communion Office "appoints for that ministration, that the priest shall put upon him a white *albe*, *plain with a vestment or cope*," and that the assistant "priests or deacons in the ministration shall have upon them *albes with tunicles*." One of the burning questions of the day is how far that rubric is binding upon the clergy of the Reformed Church of England at the present time. This is argued most fully in one of the most lucid expositions of the Church law which has been witnessed in modern times, viz., in the case of *Hebbert v. Purchas*, as set forth in the judgment of the Judicial Committee, delivered February 23, 1871. It is notorious that the ultra-Ritualists have left no stone unturned to disparage this judgment, making many excuses for their apparent determination to disobey it, notwithstanding the fact of the arguments in its support being those of two bishops as the representatives of the spirituality, and two eminent lawyers who have held the office of Lord High Chancellor, and who are consequently supposed to be unprejudiced and impartial persons, as representatives of the temporality or laity. But further, when it is recollected, that it is not their judgment, however valuable, which constitutes it the law, but *the confirmation of that judgment* by the Sovereign, as Supreme Ordinary of the Church, to whom every clergyman of the Church of England has most solemnly sworn obedience, which renders it binding both morally and legally upon every one who values the sanctity of an oath, we see in those who deny the validity of the "Purchas" judgment, only another instance of imitating that lawless party in the Church of Corinth to which we have before alluded, and to whom Clement, in his condemnation of priestcraft, thus refers: "It is right and holy rather to obey God than to follow those who, through pride and sedition, have become the leaders of a detest-

able emulation. We shall incur great danger if we rashly yield ourselves to the inclinations of men who cause strife and divisions by their conduct.... Let us cleave to those, who cultivate peace with godliness, and not to those who hypocritically profess to desire it. . . . Let us give honour to those who have the rule over us." (*Clem. Rom.*, 1 Ep. to Cor., ch. xiv., xv., xxi.) What a contrast between the teaching of a Bishop of Rome in the first century and his nominal successor Pope Pío Nono in the nineteenth! It would be well if those lawless clergy who are now making such a loud outcry against the "Purchas" judgment were only to read it, and try to understand the arguments by which it is supported. On the rightful interpretation of the "Ornaments Rubric" every unprejudiced person would be convinced that the Act of Uniformity of 1662, which enforces that rubric, can only be interpreted by the canons of 1604, which confine the legal vestments of the minister at the time of Holy Communion to a "comely surplice with sleeves;" and, therefore, forbid all those gorgeous vestments, which the ultra-Ritualistic clergy of to-day in general, and the late Mr. Purchas in particular, delight to flaunt before the eyes of their astonished followers, in wilful disobedience to the laws of God and men; thereby falling under the merited condemnation of Clement, Bishop of Alexandria, for arraying themselves in garments "*suitable only to the tomfooleries of the priests of Bacchus.*" (*Clem. Alex., Pædag.* l. ii., cap. xi.) It has been well said that the Union Jack is only a piece of bunting, but when it is made a symbol of the power and might of England, it is no more a rag but a national emblem. Even so the "Eucharistic Vestments," now worn by the sacerdotalists in the Church of England in defiance of all law and order, are a true emblem of that party whose shibboleth is openly declared to be "one in faith and sacraments with the Church of Rome."

C. PAGE 153.

The *Illustrated Catechism* alluded to as the work of Bishop Gauden, would be more exactly described as the joint work of that and many other bishops besides, chiefly of the High Church party of the day. Its title reads as follows: *A Course of Catechising; being the Marrow of all Orthodox and Practical Expositions upon the Church Catechism*; and it purports to be gathered from the works of Bishops Gauden, Andrewes, Jeremy Taylor, Usher, and many others, Dean Nowell, Richard Hooker, and other "reverend authors." Besides the reason given in the text for the minister's proper place being *at the north side of the table*, in order to "avoid the Popish superstition of standing towards the east," there is a pictorial representation of the way in which the Lord's Supper was administered by the High Church clergy in the year 1674, *i.e.*, within a few years after the last version

of the Prayer Book and the Act of Uniformity. The table is represented as standing *not* altarwise, but tablewise. The officiating minister is represented as consecrating the bread at the north side of the table before the people, who are seen kneeling around. Both the officiating minister and his assistant are each vested in something which looks more like a black gown than a comely surplice. And the following sensible explanation of the "vestment" controversy is thus given in reply to the question, "What think you of the minister's habit, as his gown, surplice, and tippet? Can you hear him in them?"—"It's no more to me what habit he prayeth or preacheth in, than it is to him what habit I hear him in: all our cloaths should be decent and comely: but the Word of God doth not depend upon the cloaths of men; his garments can no more hinder his preaching, than mine do my hearing." (P. 300.) And so Nicholls, in his *Commentary on the Book of Common Prayer*, published at the beginning of the last century, after describing the Popish practice of turning the "baek to the people," says: "Our Church enjoins *the direct contrary*, and that for a direct contrary reason. The minister is to stand before the table indeed just so long as he is ordering the bread and wine; but after that he is to go to some place where he may break the bread before the people, *which must be the north side*, there being in our present rubric no other place mentioned for performing any part of this sacrament."

D. PAGE 226.

We should bear in mind the great distinction between the old High Churchman and the advanced school of Ritualists in the present day. The Bishop of Ripon, in the York Convocation of 1875, justly declared that when the "advanced school" taught the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, they were "in perfect agreement with the apostate Church of Rome." For making this statement a clergyman of the "advanced school," as he described himself, of the name of Gray, after some quibbling on the word "repeat" and "re-present," proved his religion by reviling the bishop in a way which none but a Ritualist would have had the indecency to attempt. I have given abundant evidence in the course of this work in proof, first, of the heretical teaching of the Church of Rome on the subject of "Sacrifice;" and second, of the advanced school being in perfect agreement with that apostate community; as, *e.g.*, Canon Courteney's teaching in his *Presence of Jesus on the Altar*; or the Rev. G. Cobb's *Kiss of Peace*, in which he says, "the Church of England holds *precisely the same view* of the Lord's Supper as the Church of Rome." The distinction between the Ritualists of the "advanced school" and "the High Church party" has been well defined in two recent pamphlets which have attracted some attention, *viz.*, *Quousque?* by a High Churchman of the old school; and *Romanizing within the Church of England*, by the Rev. John W. Burgon, Vicar of St. Mary's, Oxford;

the latter of whom quotes with just severity the conduct of the advanced school for their "disloyal and dishonest adoption of tenets and practices from which our Church purged herself at the era of the Reformation." The present prime minister alluded to this distinction in his speech in the House of Commons on the Public Worship Bill. In answer to the question, What is Ritualism? he said: "I mean by Ritualism the practice by a certain portion of the clergy of the Church of England of ceremonies, which they themselves confess are symbolical of doctrines which they are pledged by every solemn compact that can bind men to their sovereign and their country to renounce and repudiate. *And of all the false pretences of this body of men, there is, in my opinion, none more glaring and pernicious, than their pretending that they are a portion of the great High Church party of England.*" Mr. Gray, in his attack on the Bishop of Ripon, and especially in bringing forward the testimony of Mr. Mackenzie as a specimen of the "advanced school," reminds us of a saying of the most eminent of the Primitive fathers, to whom we have had frequent occasion to refer, and whose writings present so pleasing a contrast to those of the sacerdotal party in the present day:—"Let our praise," wrote Clement of Rome to the Church of Corinth, "be in God, and not of ourselves; for God hateth those that commend themselves. Let testimony to our good deeds be borne by others, as it was in the case of our righteous forefathers. *Boldness, and arrogance, and audacity* belong to those that are accursed of God; but moderation, humility, and meekness to such as are blessed by Him." (*Clem. Rom.*, 1 Ep. to Cor., ch. xxx.)

E. PAGE 232.

The great distinction between the "advanced school" and the Evangelical portion of the Church of England is seen in the fact that they preach two distinct Gospels, as I have frequently pointed out in the course of this work. I have recently met with two proofs of this assertion. Dr. Littledale, a prominent member of the advanced school, in his defence of a sensuous and æsthetic worship, thus describes the correlation of doctrine and Ritualism:—"It may be argued, that good and vigorous preaching will fill the cravings of the congregations, and make the employment of material stimuli superfluous, if not mischievous. But good preaching is among the rarest of good things, much rarer in proportion than good acting; and as the great majority of actors are mere sticks, managers of theatres have constantly been compelled to make gorgeous spectacles their main attraction. Hence a lesson may be learnt by all who are not too proud to learn from the stage, for it is an axiom in liturgiology that no public worship is really deserving of its name unless it be *histrionic*." (Dr. Littledale's Essay in *The Church and World*, p. 37. 1st series. 1866.) At pp. 27, 28, I have given some

specimens of the different way in which theatrical representations were regarded by the Primitive Christians, compared with the action of the Church of Rome in the present day; and Dr. Littledale very fairly represents the worldly nature of Ritualism in distinct contrast to the unvarying, and therefore truly Catholic teaching of the Church of Christ, which, it is scarcely necessary to repeat, are wide as the poles asunder.

The second proof I have to adduce in support of my contention, though rather of a personal nature, may be mentioned, I trust, without hurting my opponent's feelings any more than it has my own. Not long ago, having read an extract from a sermon by Mr. Galton, Rector of St. Sidwell's, Exeter, and an active member of the advanced school, previous to the "special services" held by the bishop and clergy in that city during Lent, in which he was reported to have said, in allusion to the Gospel preached by Messrs. Moody and Sankey, that "the ultimate effect of such stimulants" would be to reduce their converts to the condition of *drunkards*, I felt it a duty to make a public protest against such a statement. I therefore addressed a private letter to Mr. Galton, informing him of what I had done, and, as a matter of courtesy to a brother-clergyman and a neighbour, that I had requested the printer to send him a copy. I received an answer from Mr. Galton, denying that he had made any remarks on "the mission of Messrs. Moody and Sankey," and informing me that, as he "never read anything printed at a certain printing office in Exeter, as soon as I saw the heading of your letter and its signature I committed it to the flames without reading it." To this I replied by giving my authority for the charge of his having made some "remarks on Messrs. Moody and Sankey," viz., the *Exeter Gazette* of the day following on which the sermon was preached, and which, as being the organ of the Ritualistic party in Exeter, was not likely to have made a false statement on such a matter as this. I further pointed out, that it was a poor excuse on Mr. Galton's part to consider the fact of my public letter having been "printed at a certain printing office (I might have added, and also as being signed by a theological opponent,) a sufficient justification for refusing to notice the charge against you of having calumniated Christian men." Mr. Galton evidently took a different view of the matter, as my second letter was returned by the next post, with the following words in Mr. Galton's handwriting on the envelope, "*Opened, but not read.*" I do not believe it is usual, even with the members of the "advanced school," to treat their opponents with such marked discourtesy; but in this instance, I conclude the still, small voice of conscience made Mr. Galton reckless in his assertions, and forgetful of the common feelings of propriety due from a Ritualistic clergyman even to the meanest of Christians. As regards his charge against Messrs. Moody and Sankey, no one who has any knowledge of what they teach, or of the result of their mission, (which I believe to be the most marvellous work since the day of Pentecost, and we know from St. Peter's speech that the unbelieving Jews on that occasion calumniated the

Christian converts in the same way as Mr. Galton has done now,) will give credit to such an accusation; and we should pray that his eyes may be opened to see the beauty and to know the power of "the Gospel of the grace of God," which the American revivalists have preached with such signal blessing in many cities of our land. I have met with two different testimonies as to the effect of Mr. Sankey's singing, one of which certainly confirms the opinion expressed by Mr. Galton of the hostility which the Ritualists naturally evince towards this marvellous work of grace. The *Spectator*, as the able representative of worldly literature, observes: "Mr. Sankey's main power is in his solo singing, which is full of sweetness and genuine tenderness of tune. His singing of the hymn, 'Jesus of Nazareth passeth by,' and of that on 'The Lost Sheep,' especially the feeling with which he sang,

'Out in the desert He heard its cry,
Sick and helpless, and ready to die,'

were remarkable, and were distinguished by a delicacy and serenity of expression that could hardly be too much admired." On the other hand, the *Saturday Review*, which if it cannot be called a representative of the advanced school, is known to be the property of a wealthy Ritualist, and is notorious for its hostility to much that is noble and Christian in its articles and reviews, thus portrays Mr. Sankey's endeavour to sing to the praise and glory of God: "There can be no doubt that his art is of a tricky kind, and aims at producing effect by sudden alternation between high and low. His favourite note is one in the back of his throat, with which he pours forth a prolonged and hollow O! O! O! *Something between a howl and a wail*, which makes one think of a melodious costermonger crying his cabbages." Although this is a melancholy specimen of some of the "hard speeches" which professing Christians delight to utter against those who are working day and night to bring sinners to God, it scarcely equals in severity the saying of Dr. Littledale concerning our martyred Reformers, that "in cruelty, impiety and licentiousness," they far exceeded the leaders of the Jacobins of the great French Revolution; and which contains as much truth as the cry of the persecuting heathen against Polycarp and his fellow-martyrs of the second century,—*"Away with the Atheists! It is not fit that such should live."*

I would briefly allude to two attempts made recently in the city of Exeter: one conducted exclusively by the clergy (many of them being Ritualists) of the Church of England at the commencement of Lent, 1875; the other after Easter of the same year, carried out by lay members of the Church of England and Nonconformists combined, and assisted by a few of the Evangelical clergy and Dissenting ministers. Having been privileged to take part in both of these missions, I can only say that in point of spiritual life and light, and, as I expect time will prove, in permanent results likewise, the latter was as superior to the former, as "the Gospel of the grace of God" must of necessity be superior to that "other Gospel," which is so ineffectually preached by unconverted men,

F. PAGE 93.

I think it well to give one or two more specimens of the way in which the Ritualistic clergy are in the habit of treating the judgments of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, which are in reality those of the Sovereign, as Supreme Ordinary of the Church, to whom every clergyman is pledged most solemnly, as we have frequently pointed out, to obey. The Rev. E. Stuart, Incumbent of St. Mary Magdalen, London, is reported in the public journals to have thus expressed himself in a sermon:—"The Judicial Committee is trying to enforce an unjust judgment upon us, and trying to compel us to submit to it by sheer tyranny. To their unjust judgment I will not consent: to their tyranny I will not submit: so help me, God. This was accompanied by a solemn kissing of the Bible." Is it possible to conceive a greater mockery of religion than this open and avowed specimen of the value entertained by a Ritualist of the obligation of the most sacred vows? In a similar strain Mr. Orby Shipley, in his *Secular Judgments in Spiritual Matters*, writes, when pointing out the way by which a subtle casuist may evade the law he has sworn to obey:—"Forbidden to light two candles *on* the altar, I would place them *above* the altar. Prevented from mixing the chalice in the *sanctuary*, I would mix water with wine in the *vestry*. If it be unlawful to *kneel in adoration* during the prayer of consecration, I would *genuflect*. If it be unlawful to *genuflect*, I would *bow*. Is it against the decision of the Judicial Committee to elevate *the paten*? I would elevate *the host*. Is it against its decision to elevate *the whole cup*? I would elevate *the rim* of the chalice above the head"!!! Surely all comment is needless here. And the following instance, which was recorded in the public journals at the time, will show how determined the Ritualists are to practise the principle of evasion as recommended by Mr. Orby Shipley. About four years ago, the Bishop of Rochester was asked to consecrate St. Andrew's Church, Plaistow, which he declined to do, after an inspection of the church, until an illegal and idolatrous stone image, in the form of a crucifix affixed to the reredos, was removed from the church. After many attempts on the part of the "lawless" incumbent to evade his diocesan's requirement, such as that there was no time to remove it, or that the expense of removal would be inconveniently large, the Bishop at length consented to consecrate the church, under a solemn promise that the objectionable carving should be covered during the time of consecration, and immediately afterwards removed. The carving was covered, and the church was consecrated; but a few days later the incumbent wrote to the bishop to say he declined to remove the crucifix, on the ground that it had been consecrated with the church. Such are the ethics of Ritualism. *Ex uno disce omnes.*

G. PAGE 244.

The *Guardian* of March 24th, 1875, contains a reprint from the *Daily News* of a correspondence between the Bishop of London and the Rev. Samuel Minton, an unbeneficed clergyman of the Established Church ; from which it appears that the bishop accuses Mr. Minton of acting *anomoos*, (*i.e.*, lawlessly, or above the law,) for having accepted an invitation to preach in the pulpit of a Nonconformist Church. As this is the very same charge which the Evangelicals bring against the Ritualists, it may be well to point out the immense distinction between the two. The bishop inhibits Mr. Minton from preaching “ the Gospel of the grace of God ” in a certain locality, because he supposes it to be contrary to the law. Mr. Minton, like every clergyman, is pledged to “ obey his ordinary, and to submit to his godly admonitions and judgments.” But in this instance the law has not been tested whether it is illegal for a clergyman to preach in the pulpit of a brother-minister who is a Nonconformist : and the most violent Ritualist will scarcely go so far as to term an inhibition against preaching the Gospel of Christ a “ godly admonition and judgment.” Should the law be once pronounced that it is an illegal act for a clergyman to preach the Gospel from the pulpit of a Nonconformist Church, we may be sure that there is not an Evangelical who would not readily and at once submit to the ruling of the Supreme Ordinary of the Church, or else retire from communion with a Church which could sanction a prohibition against preaching the Gospel of Christ. On the other hand, if we take the case of Mr. Mackonochie as a specimen of Ritualistic lawlessness, we find, after a fair and impartial trial, and after judgment having been pronounced by the Supreme Ordinary against him, on all or almost every one of the charges brought against him, Mr. Mackonochie thought it consistent with his ordination vows, and with the profession of a Christian minister, to publish to the world this defiant and profane reply :—“ *We do not mean to obey, and if God gives us grace so to do, will meet any punishment rather than obey.*” Can there be a moment’s doubt as to which party in the Church the term of *anomoos* more properly belongs ? And it is believed that the bishop has not thought fit to withdraw the license of a single curate in his diocese, however extreme his “ lawlessness ; ” but, on the contrary, has delighted to honour and promote such clergymen as Mr. Berdmore Compton to places of dignity, notwithstanding the earnest petition of the faithful laity against the nomination, in this instance, of any but an honest Protestant pastor.

I do not know what the result has been ; but I rejoice to see, in the correspondence between Mr. Minton and the Bishop of London, that a combined movement has been inaugurated for promoting spiritual intercourse between the Protestant party in the Church of England and our Nonconformist brethren, by the free interchange of pulpit ministrations, and of effecting, if necessary, an alteration in the present law, in order to promote

so desirable an end. When a powerful party, who are notorious for their disobedience to all law and order, are doing all in their power to bring "the Protestant religion established by law" under the dominion of that worse than Egyptian bondage, from which our forefathers were mercifully delivered three centuries ago by the constancy and faith of our martyred Reformers, it surely becomes every faithful member of the Church of England to do all that lies in His power to promote communion with his Nonconformist brethren, who are united by that most binding of ties community of faith, and to separate as much as possible from all intercourse with that lawless, disorderly party so well described by Mr. Maskell as holding all the doctrines of the Council of Trent, while they retain their benefices in the Protestant Church. After a long-continued study of the doctrines and principles which have been taught during the last forty years by the Romanizing party in the Church of England, I am compelled to the painful conclusion that there is as much difference, as vast a gulf between them and the doctrines and principles of the Primitive Christians, or of the Reformers of the sixteenth century, whether in England, Scotland, Germany, Switzerland, and France, or of the Evangelical party throughout the world in the present day, as there is between heathenism and Christianity. I dare not, in the name of God, say otherwise. I dare not, as some would fain do, patch up a "peace of untempered mortar" where no real peace exists; for we cannot but feel with Jehu, under the old dispensation, that there can be "no peace so long as the whoredoms of thy mother Jezebel and her witchcrafts are so many;" and with St. John under the new, that there can be no communion with that "great whore that sitteth upon many waters, with whom the kings of the earth have committed fornication," whose title is published to the world as "Mystery, Babylon the Great, the Mother of Harlots and Abominations of the Earth,"—as Bishop Hall so well expressed it two centuries ago in his famous saying, "NO PEACE WITH ROME." For "what concord has Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? for ye are the temple of the living God; as God has said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people." (2 Cor. vi. 16.)

II. PAGE 251.

The *Church Times* of January, 1872, boasted that "the good things of promotion had not been denied in 1871, as they used to be denied to (Romanizing) Catholic priests; and it is even true that in the great cities (Ritualistic) Catholicism is rapidly becoming popular, and a few quondam Evangelicals have awoke to the fact that, *regarded as a means of obtaining*

an income, it (Ritualism) pays, and they have endeavoured to affiliate themselves accordingly." We are not surprised at a Ritualistic journal using such a worldly argument, with a view to support the end it has in view, of closely following the practices of that fallen Church, one of whose special marks is noted in Scripture as making "merchandize of the souls of men;" but it is a mistake to say that such is applicable to the Evangelical party; whether it be viewed as regards the mercenary principles of the Ritualists towards others not of their own sect, or in relation to the support which they are now receiving from their ecclesiastical superiors, notwithstanding the anti-Christian rancour which they display towards them—e.g., I have read of an advertisement in the *Church Times*, asking for "fifty pounds to rescue 200 souls from Dissent," which, as a critic points out, is the very moderate sum of "just 5s. a-piece;" but no one, with a spark of religious principle within him, would ever think of adopting such unholy traffic in souls, save an honest Papist or a dishonest Ritualist. Or, regarding this subject from another point of view, viz., the mode of meteing out patronage by our bishops to the two chief parties in our Church at this present time; I have now before me two letters on this subject, addressed to the public journals, pointing out the very different measure meted out by the Bishops of Exeter and Oxford, who may be regarded as fair representatives of two different schools, the High and the Broad Church, towards the Evangelical clergy, compared with the favour which they show to others. Of the former, it is said that since his coming into the diocese, five years ago, there is only one instance of an Evangelical clergyman having been promoted, and that not to a benefice, but to a small proprietary chapel in Exeter, which no Ritualist would deign to accept. Of the Bishop of Oxford, who received his promotion at the same time with the Bishop of Exeter, it is said that "out of the forty clergymen whom the bishop has presented to livings in his gift since he has been in the diocese, twenty-nine, according to the Clergy Directory, signed the remonstrance on the Purchas judgment, and the other eleven are all extreme men." And yet the Bishop of Oxford signed the Bishop's Allocution, intended or supposed to represent the mind of the Episcopate against Ritualism. The public naturally expect a little more consistency even from bishops, who, though placed in a very trying position, and surrounded with much worldly pomp, and often misled by bad advisers, are nevertheless bound by their consecration vows "with all faithful diligence to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God's word," as well as "to correct and punish such as be unquiet, disobedient, and criminous within the diocese," instead of promoting them to places of honour and "pay," according to the boast of the *Church Times*. It would be a happy thing for the Church of England if every one of her bishops had the courage to speak and act as the Bishop of Durham has done, especially when declining to sign the imperfect protest of his brother-bishops against Ritualism.

I. PAGE 255.

In summing up the specialities of Ritualism, we must not forget the many attempts made by Dr. Pusey and his disciples to promote union between the Churches of England and Rome, and to show how a clergyman may hold the doctrines of the one while retaining the status and emoluments of the other—the conduct of Mr. Orby Shipley and his allies in sanctioning the use of the English Communion Service interleaved with the “mass” book of the Latin Church—the defiance of Mr. Mackonochie to the ruling of the Supreme Ordinary, to whom his obedience had been most solemnly pledged—the opinion expressed by Canon Liddon and others that the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council were actuated by other feelings than those of law and justice—the various opinions of Ritualistic clergymen respecting the judgment on the *Purchas* case, that it need not be obeyed because it was given on an undefended suit, or that it affected the condemned criminal only, or because it was “bad law” according to Dr. Pusey, and that it was of no more value, according to Mr. Bennett, than “the opinion of the first ten men taken out of the street”—the violent hostility manifested by the advanced school against the name and principles of Protestantism, notwithstanding they are ministers of “the Protestant Reformed Religion established by law”—the assumption of the word “Catholic” as the exclusive possession of the Ritualistic party in defiance of all history and antiquity—the virtual violation of their ordination vows respecting the counsels of bishops in general and the ruling of the Supreme Ordinary in particular—the practical assertion of being “above the law” avowed by the advanced school, such being one of the marks of the predicted apostasy—the principles of evasion recommended by Mr. Orby Shipley and others in order to carry out their views—the disingenuousness which the Ritualistic system permits, and which has been justly defined by the Papal advocate, M. Capel, as “the organised dishonesty of Ritualism and its deleterious influence on English family life”—their tricks in the domain of literature, which have led them to tamper with “Keble,” to misquote “Hooker,” to falsify “John Bunyan,” and to calumniate anything and everything bearing the name of Protestantism, so that it may redound to the praise and honour and glory of Rome—the unbridled license of the Ritualistic press towards all who happen to differ from them, of which we have given many specimens in the course of this work: *e.g.*, the Queen, in consequence of her ruling in the *Purchas* case, is compared by the Rev. Thomas W. Mossman, Rector of East and West Torrington, in a letter to the *Church News* of April, 1868, to “Nero, Domitian, and Diocletian,” the three noted persecutors of the early Christians—the Reformers, because they rejected the Papal Antichrist, and gave their lives for what they believed to be the truth, are termed “unredeemed villains”—the bishops, who are most consistent in condemning the non-primitive, uncatholic, and in many respects anti-

christian tenets of Ritualism, are condemned with a vituperative coarseness of language which no one who has proper respect either for himself or the religion of which he professes to be a minister would employ. I will give one specimen of the "hard speeches," to use the language of St. Jude, which "ungodly sinners" will utter, even in the house of God, in support of their own cause. Mr. Stanton, one of the curates at St. Alban's, in a sermon preached after Mr. Mackonochie's merited condemnation, thus characterised the action of his own diocesan for allowing the matter even to be brought to trial. After the usual torrents of abuse, so congenial to the Ritualistic mind, describing the trial as "a burning shame," "a blow on the cheek," and "an insult," this professed minister of Christ explained his text, *Man shall not live by bread alone*, as applicable to the Bishop of London, in the following way:—"The prelate who had condemned their incumbent never had kept and never intended to keep the regulations of the Prayer Book, and although he received £10,000 a-year, he did not, or ought not, *to live by bread alone*; and this same prelate must take care that he did not go down to the grave *dishonoured* and certainly *unloved*;"—the notorious insincerity and lawlessness which characterize their proceedings, as, *e.g.*, in the present controversy concerning "vestments" and "the eastward position;" at one time denying their importance, at another affirming that they symbolise their character of "sacrificing priests," and always disobedient to the ruling of the Supreme Authority in our Church, which has decided that both these things are ILLEGAL—the frequent instances of disloyalty to "the powers that be," whether exhibited towards their Sovereign, their Church, or their country—their unrighteous attempt to abolish "the Thirty-nine Articles," as the standard of doctrinal truth in the Reformed Church of England—the fact of the Ritualistic creed being one with that of Rome is proved by M. Capel's admission that all of his numerous converts declare they were taught precisely the same doctrines when professed members of the Church of England;—all these things, and many more of a like nature which we have not space to recount, confirm the belief that the religion professed by the members of the "advanced school" in the present day is no better than a human mixture of Judaism, Heathenism, and Romanism, which has been faithfully defined by an eminent bishop of the Protestant Church in America in the following terms:—"The whole system of Ritualism," said the saintly Bishop Melvaine, "is one of Church instead of Christ—priest instead of the Gospel—concealment of truth instead of manifestation of truth—ignorant superstition instead of enlightened faith—bondage wherein we are promised liberty—all tending to load us with whatever is odious in the worst meaning of priestcraft, in place of the free, affectionate, enlarging, elevating, and cheerful liberty of a child of God." AMEN.

INDEX.

A.

ABSOLUTION, priestly, 179; unknown to Primitive Christians, 180, 189; adopted at Trent, 189; rejected by Cranmer, 190

Absolution, the earliest form precatory, 184; form of, in English Church in the eighth century, 192

Agapè, the, 49

Altar, the term, explained by Bishop Ridley, 58; by the early Christians, 60—62; when first used, 63; heresy of Pope Fabian respecting it, 64;—of stone first known in the sixth century, 65

Andrewes, Bishop, on Eucharistic sacrifice, 72; acknowledges Presbyterian ordination, 247

Antichrist, title of, how applicable to the Church of Rome according to Pope Gregory I.; how understood by Church of England, 5, 233; marks of, 6, 124, 224

Apostolical succession, explained by the Ritualistic school, 236

Arian doctrine, described by Theodoret, 33

Athanasius on the eastward position, 149

Augustine, the monk, his Antichristian conduct on arriving in England, 84

Augustine, St., on the Trinity, 9; on the supremacy of Holy Scripture, 35; on the millennium, 56; on the identity of the Lord's table with the

term altar, 65; explains the Christian's sacrifice, 83; language when figurative, 96; reasons why some worshipped towards the east, 149; condemns auricular confession, 161; God alone can absolve, 189; his deep spiritual teaching, 235

B.

Bacon on vestments, 112

Bellarmino, Cardinal, on purgatory, 203; as a controversialist, 211

Bennett, Rev. J.W., on the "reserved" Sacrament, 28; change of views respecting the Lord's Supper, 51; advocates Sacramental adoration, 69; the "visible" presence, 102; once against auricular confession, 183; advocates prayers for the dead, 195

Beveridge, Bishop, denies a "sacrifice" in the Lord's Supper, 77; against Sacramental adoration, 239; on righteousness, 235

Blomfield, Bishop, condemns auricular confession, 173

Bonaventura, Cardinal, his idolatry, 213

Boniface, missionary to Germany, considers vestments a sign of Antichrist, 113, 124

Browne, Harold, Bishop, on the evil results of the confessional, 173

Burgon, Rev. J., on the treatment of "Keble" by the Romanizers, 90; on the dishonesty of the Ritualists, 264

C.

- Canon of Catholicity, 15
 Capel, M., on the identity of Romanism and Ritualism, 128; on "the organized dishonesty" of the Ritualists, 192
 Catholic, the term, defined, 1, 2
 Chalice, the mixed, 23, 24
 Chambers, Rev. J. C., his work on the confessional, 177
 Church Times, the, quoted, 129, 140, 251, 252, 268
 Churches, early, with entrances eastward, 148
 Cicero and Clement of Alexandria, on making God, 96
 Clement of Alexandria on vestments, 118
 Clement of Rome, on sacerdotal arrogance, 264
 Communion, evening, partaken of by Primitive Christians, 48; fasting, unknown in the early Church, 53
 Confession, auricular, unknown to the Primitive Christians, 158—162; controversy with a priest, 163; admitted to have been introduced in the eighth century, 164; established in the thirteenth century, 165; rejected by Convocation, 171; condemned by English bishops, 172; evil results admitted by various Popes, 174; and Roman priests, 175; how abused at Constantinople, 182; advocated by the late Mr. Keeble, 175
 Connelly, Pierce, Rev., his exposure of the confessional, 176
 Convocation of 1531 rejects the Papal supremacy, 8, 167
 Cosin, Bishop, quoted, 68, 77, 153
 Courtenay, Canon, on the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, 69
 Cranmer, on auricular confession, 171
 Creed of Pope Pius IV. uncatholic and antiscritptural, 203

Cross, doctrine of the, how understood by the Primitive Christians, 38—43

D.

- Daillé, on auricular confession, 162; on the right use of the fathers, 241
 Decretals, false, date of, 64
 Denison, Archdeacon, on auricular confession, 164, 169
 Directorium Anglicanum, on vestments, 119
 Drummond, Mr., in controversy with the general of the Jesuits, 109
 Durandus, on the eastward position, 149

E.

- Eastward position, unknown to the Primitive Church, 147; commanded by Pope Vigilius, 149; forbidden by the Church of England, 151; declared by High Churchmen to be "a Popish superstition," 153
 Edward I., prayer concerning confession in his time, 166
 Edward VI., his first Prayer Book on auricular confession, 167; his second Book on the same, 168; on vestments, 261

F.

- Figurative interpretation of Lord's Supper taught by the early fathers, 97, 98; by the Church of England, 105; by Jeremy Taylor, 106
 Freeman, Archdeacon, condemns prayer for the dead, 196
 Froude's Remains concerning Keeble's teaching, 90

G.

- Galton, Rev. J., his attack upon Messrs. Moody and Sankey, 265
 Gladstone, Right Hon. W. E., on the hopeless attempt to Romanize the Church of England, 249

Goar, Jacobus, on absolution in the East, 191

Gown, black, when introduced into England, 117

Grossetete, Bishop, on fasting, 53

H.

Homilies of Church of England quoted, 27, 100

Hooker, on the Real Presence, 12, 100

I.

Idolatry, defined by Tertullian, 18 ; in Spain, 27 ; of the Church of Rome respecting the cross, 43 ; condemned by the Church of England, 44 ; practised at St. Alban's, Holborn, 213

Images, allowed by the Council of Oxford in the fifteenth century, 205 ; adored with the worship due to God, 206 ; how introduced into the Church of Rome, 206 ; rejected by the ancient British Church, 207 ; described as "baby-worship" by Archbishop Winemar, 207 ; creeping into the Church of England, 209 ; condemned by the early fathers, 214—216 ; by the Council of Eliberis, 217 ; by the Church of England, 218

Incense, used by the heathen and the Church of Rome, 138 ; rejected by the Primitive Christians save for burials, 139, 142

J.

Jerome, on the dress of the clergy, 122

Jewel, Bishop, on sacrifice, 74 ; on auricular confession, 171 ; justification by faith, taught by the Church of England, 223

K.

Keble, Rev. John, concerning "not in the hands," 89 ; advocates auricular confession, 175

Kiss of Peace, author of, on the identity of doctrine between England and Rome, 81

L.

Lawlessness, distinction between Evangelicals and Ritualists regarding, 268

Leighton, Archbishop, on Christian unity, 10 ; on holiness, 235

Leo, Pope, tolerates heathen customs, 149 ; his heresy respecting the "blessed" Mary, 211

Liddon, Canon, quoted, 90 ; his opinion of the Evangelical movement, 227

Lightfoot, Dr. John, on the mixed cup, 23

Lightfoot, Canon, on Episcopacy, 245

"Lights," useless, unknown to Primitive Christians, 133 ; described by Lactantius as employed only by madmen, 133 ; forbidden in the Church of England, 134 ; pronounced illegal by two Lord Chancellors, 145

Littledale, Dr., on the Real Presence, 87 ; on incense, 142 ; on purgatory, 196 ; his opinion of the Reformers, 232 ; on histrionic worship, 265

Liturgies, Jewish, 29 ; of the Church of Antioch, 29 ; of St. James, 29 ; containing false doctrines, 63

Longley, Archbishop, on the Romanizing clergy of the Church of England, 128

Lord's Supper, how understood by the Primitive Christians, 46—48

M.

Maekonoehie, Rev. A. H., his hatred of Protestantism, 141 ; sets up a life-size idol in St. Alban's, 213 ; defies the law, 26

Manning, Dr., specimen of his profanity, 127 ; his eulogy on the Church of England previous to his apostasy, vii

"Man of Sin," title applied to the Papacy by the Churches of England, Scotland, and Ireland, 5; and by Bishop Wordsworth, 6

Mariolatry of the Church of Rome, 210—213

Martyrs, the, of the second and sixteenth centuries reviled by the heathen and Ritualists alike, 266

Maskell, Rev. W., on the dishonesty of the Ritualistic clergy, 92

"Mother of God," term first heard in the fifth century, 212

Millennium, doctrine of, taught by the early fathers, 55, 56; by Florence of Worcester, 57

Minton, the Rev. S., accused by the Bishop of London of lawlessness, 267

Montalembert, Count, on the term "Catholic," 5; his opinion of the Church of England, 222

Morality, higher standard of, in Protestant than in Popish countries, 177, 252

Morinus, on early forms of absolution, 186; admits priestly absolution to have been unknown in the Church for twelve centuries, 191

Mossman, the Rev. T. W., compares the Queen to Nero and other persecutors, 271

N.

Newfoundland, Bishop of, suggests a mode of evading the law, 26

Newman, Dr. J. H., author of Tract XC., 91; his definition of truth, 101; challenges the Evangelical clergy, 188; on miracles, 238; his proof on behalf of the Church of Rome, 238

No altar, no sacrifice, no priest, among the Primitive Christians, 66

Nonconformists, union with, advocated, 1, 248

"North side," the, how understood in the twelfth century, 155; and in the eighteenth century, 263; ruling of Bishop Phillpotts on the subject, 155; explained by Professor Blunt, 156; rejected by the disobedient clergy, 156

O.

Orby Shipley, Rev., his treachery to the Church of England, 93; recommends evasion, 267

Ornaments rubric, the, explained, 114, 116

P.

Pictures in churches, introduced by heretics, 210; condemned by Epiphanius, 211

Phillpotts, Bishop, on Tract XC., 91; on the dishonesty of the Ritualists, 93; on the Lord's Supper, 95; on the eastward position, 155; against priestly absolution, 169

Powercourt, Lady, respecting the believer's standing, 15

Prayer for the dead, same as purgatory, 195; unknown to the Primitive Christians, 200, 202; condemned by the Church of England, 199; advocated by Ritualists, 199; copied by the Church of Rome, 203, 204

Presbyterian orders, acknowledged by the Church of England, 244—247

Priestcraft, growth of, 242

Primitive Faith, the, defined by the early fathers, 16—18

Protestants, term used in the Vulgate, 7

Protestantism, described by Ritualists, 140, 193

Pusey, Dr., on sacrifice, 69; identifies the Churches of England and Rome, 70, 106; on the distinction between "mass" and "masses," 71; declines Dr. Vogan's challenge, 75; misrepresents St. Augustine, 83;

Hooker, 88; Keble, 89; Book of Homilies, 99; and Tertullian, 102; Latimer, 105; on the Real Presence, 86; vindicates Tract XC., 91; denies the "figurative" interpretation, 99; threatens to resign his office, 103; author's respect for him, 104; as a controversialist, 107; on vestments, 119; the Eucharist, 154; auricular confession, 179; his love for the Evangelicals, 225; his views on baptism, 237

Purchas' case, the, 25, 261

Q.

Queen of heaven, the "blessed" Mary so termed, by the Church of Rome and other false Christians, 4, 214

R.

Real Presence, doctrine of the, as taught by the Ritualistic clergy, 86—9

Reformation, the, described by Ritualists and Papists, 140, 193, 232

Reichel, Dr., on absolution, 180

Ridley, Bishop, on sacrifice, 58

Ripon, the Bishop of, reviled by a Ritualist, 263

Ritual, Royal Commission of, on vestments, 129

Ritualism described by the *Times*, 21; and by Mr. Disraeli, 264; identified with Romanism, 70, 81, 94, 128, 192; its specialities, 271, 272

Ritualistic press, revilings of the, 129, 140, 247, 251, 253, 263

Ritualists, their reason for vestments, 126; and for useless lights, 135; abuse of Protestants, 140, 193, 232; their lawlessness, 26, 154, 267; advocate prayer for the dead, 196; claim equality with God, 237; condemned by Mr. Gladstone, 249; of the seventeenth century, described by Lord Falkland, 243

Rock, Dr., on vestments, 110; respecting the eastward position, 157

Rome, Church of, idolatrous and uncatholic, 4

S.

Sacrifice, Eucharistic, taught equally by Romanists and Ritualists, 69, 70, 73; spiritually taught by the early fathers, 78—82; how introduced into England, 84; quibble between repeat and repeat, 263

Salisbury use, explained, 192

Savoy Conference, 117

Seymour, Rev. Hobart, replies to Newman's challenge, 188; work on the Confessional, 180

Sharp, Archbishop, on the Real Presence, 220

Sibylline Oracles, respecting incense, 143

Supremacy of Scripture, 34, 35

Supremacy of the Crown, 26

Supreme Head of the Church, title granted to the Crown before the Reformation, 167

Supreme Ordinary, the, in the Church of England, 25

Stuart, Rev. E., on the Eucharistic sacrifice, 73

Swainson, Canon, on vestments, 116

T.

Taliessyn, chief of the Welsh bards, respecting the Church of Rome, 207

Tertullian, quoted, 18, 28, 43, 49, 55, 79, 97, 102, 142, 148, 189, 215

Tract No. XC., condemned by Archbishop Whateley and Bishop Phillpotts, 91; vindicated by Dr. Pusey, 91

Transubstantiation, doctrine of, condemned by Cicero and Clement of Alexandria, 96

Trinity, doctrine of, defined by St. Augustine, 9

Truth, explained by various authors, 101

Tyndall, Professor, on colour blindness, 92

IV.

Union Review, on identity of doctrine between England and Rome, 94

Universal Bishop, title of, declared by Pope Gregory I. to be a mark of Antichrist, 224

Usher, Archbishop, condemns auricular confession, 159; and prayer for the dead, 197; concerning the religion of the ancient Irish, 207

V.

"Vestments," unknown to the Primitive Christians, 111, 118; suitable to the priests of Bacchus, 119; worn by the heathen, 122; by the Ritualistic clergy, 123; by the priests of Baal, 125; described in Scripture as Babylonian garments, 127; rejected at the Reformation, 130; adapted by the Jesuits in China to the practice of the heathen, 131

Victor, Pope, reproved by Irenæus, 24

Vogan, Dr., his challenge to Dr. Pusey, 74

W.

Walafridus Strabo, on vestments, 113

West, Temple, Rev. R., his disloyalty, 254; condemned by the Bishop of Peterborough, 255

Wharton Marriott, Rev., on vestments, 111

Wilberforce, Bishop, reviled by *Church Times*, 129; condemns auricular confession, 172

Williams, Bishop of Lincoln, his judgment respecting the "north side," 152

Wordsworth, Bishop, applies the term "that man of sin" to the Papacy, 6; condemns fasting Communion, 53; describes the Church of England as both "Catholic" and "Protestant," 244

Woodard, Canon, preaches the doctrine of the mass, 260

Worship of Primitive Christians described by the early fathers, 22, 30

Y.

Young, Rev. F., his faithful expostulation with the Bishop of Oxford for allowing images in churches, 208

ERRATUM.

On page 176, last line but one of text, *for* "its author to the Rev.,"
read "its author, the Rev."

862076

